TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 04144 9166

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

The Gift of
The Friends of the Library

4

Alex. Bonson

G. A. Andrew

THE DOCTRINE

OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

AS TO THE

EFFECTS OF BAPTISM

IN THE CASE OF

INFANTS.

With an Appendix,

CONTAINING

THE BAPTISMAL SERVICES

OF

LUTHER AND THE NUREMBERG AND COLOGNE LITURGIES.

BY

WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.S.A.

RECTOR OF ALLHALLOWS THE GREAT AND LESS, LONDON.

Second Edition.

LONDON:

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1850.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON, 1, GOUGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET.

OCT 1 6 1995

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

I AM unwilling to enlarge a work, which has already extended beyond the limits originally contemplated, by adding here anything more than a very few prefatory remarks explanatory of its object; which is, to point out what doctrine the Church of England requires to be held by her ministers on the subject of the effects of Baptism in the case of Infants. And the first question that occurs in such an investigation is, whether, among all the various *shades* of view that have been entertained on this point, she has selected one, to the exclusion of all others, to which she requires their assent; or, whether she has only adopted one *class* of views within which their doctrine is to be found. It will appear, on a careful examination of the authorities on which the determination of this question rests, that the latter is the case. And this is what we might, *à priori*, have expected.

That different shades of doctrine on this point, *within certain limits*, should be left open to us, is to my mind creditable to her character as a Scriptural Church not seeking to bind her ministers to certain exact and precise determinations on such points, going beyond the declarations of Holy Scripture. The contrary course she leaves to the Church of the Council of Trent, and an infallible Pope. They who are willing to take their faith from the dicta of one or more Italian Bishops, may be satisfied to swear by any particular view which their oracle offers them: and if the last contradict the first, and the middle are consistent with neither; and the divines respectively contemporary with the first,

middle, and last, are equally at variance with each other, and among themselves, their followers in the present age may, perhaps, be contented to accept the solution of these perplexities that has lately been offered them in the theory of "development," a system which will smooth all difficulties and set at rest all doubts.

The Church of England, rejecting all but the written word of God as the authority for her faith, lays down her deductions from the express declarations of that sacred word, on the great truths of Christianity and the disputed points of faith on which the Church has at various times been agitated with controversies, as the rule by which she expects her children to be guided. But where Scripture is silent, or appeared to her open to different views, there she is equally so. She receives even the three Creeds, only because she believes they may be "proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." She is not therefore likely to require of her members the belief of what she does not suppose may be *similarly* proved.

So far as she has definitely spoken, there all who have subscribed her Formularies and minister in her communion are bound, so long as they remain in her service, to abide by and maintain her determinations. Rather should I say, they are found in her communion because they conscientiously believe her determinations to be right.

There are *vital* and *fundamental* points on which she has spoken definitely and expressly, so as to forbid the slightest deviation from one precise line to the right hand or to the left. There are *important* points, such as that discussed in the following work, on which she has laid down certain limits on both sides,

Quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum.

That those limits have been transgressed, fearfully transgressed, by some among us, I should be the last to deny. The following pages may perhaps tend to show, *by whom* they have been transgressed; and such transgression I should be the last to justify.

The great point in dispute in our Church at the present time, is briefly this, Whether the full baptismal blessing is, in the

case of infants, under all circumstances, invariably and universally bestowed; whether, in fact, God has pledged himself, whenever an infant is baptized, apart from all consideration of every other circumstance except the mere act of baptism, to give that child, in the act, the full blessing of spiritual regeneration.

And though, in prosecuting the inquiry, what is the doctrine of our Church upon the subject, it has been necessary to show the theological school to which our Reformers and early Divines were attached, in order more fully to illustrate the meaning of the Formularies they drew up, the determination of the doctrine of our Church on the question at issue does not depend upon our connecting the theology of our Church with one particular system. Men of very different schools among us have agreed in taking the negative view on the point in controversy. But certainly when the theology of our early divines is taken into account in the matter, the statement that the universal and unconditional efficacy of baptism in the case of infants is the doctrine of our Church, is one which carries its own condemnation on the face of it.

The *contrast* between such a doctrine and the theological system of our early divines, reduces it to an absurdity.

In the face of the testimonies produced in the following work, I am at a loss to understand what ground there is left for the maintenance of such an assertion.

I have shown, that the testimony of our Archbishops, Bishops, and the Divinity Professors of our Universities, at and for a long period after the Reformation, is wholly opposed to the notion of spiritual regeneration being always conferred upon infants in their baptism, and that they were followed at a later period by divines who, though of a different school, agreed with them on the main point of the controversy;—I have shown that the Services of our Prayer Book upon which the assertion that this is the doctrine of our Church is almost wholly rested, were submitted to the judgment of Peter Martyr and Bucer, whose sentiments were notoriously opposed to such a doctrine, and that they fully approved of them, with exceptions no way touching the point now in question; I have shown that Bucer himself drew up Services of a precisely similar kind to our own, *and*

from which our own are confessed to have been "freely borrowed," when holding sentiments which render it *necessary* for those Services to be interpreted on the hypothetical principle;—I have shown that the earliest (and those publicly authorized) Expositions of our Articles and Catechism support the same view;—I ask, then, what remains wanting for the establishment of a complete and perfect proof, that this doctrine is not the doctrine of our Church, but, on the contrary, is opposed to it?

And I cannot help remarking, how completely the case before us proves the unfitness of Liturgical forms to answer the purpose of a dogmatical standard of faith; and the errors and absurdities which men might fall into when deducing doctrine, inferentially, from devotional phrases occurring in a Book of Prayer.

It remains only for me to remark, that the following work has been written and passed through the press, not merely within a much shorter period than I could have wished to have given to it, but amidst the pressure of numerous other engagements. The circumstances of the times, however, forbade delay. And I make the remark, not as pleading guilty to any ill-considered statements, or hasty conclusions, or the citation of authorities which will not stand the most searching scrutiny, (so far as my imperfect powers qualify me for the task undertaken)—on the contrary, the work is the result of much previous labour, undertaken in the hope of being prepared for the vindication of truth when the fitting occasion presented itself—but from the feeling that I have scarcely had the opportunity to do the subject full justice.

As it is, I present it to the reader in the humble hope that it may tend to clear the real character of the doctrine of our Church on the subject discussed; and thus remove the misapprehensions, and refute the misrepresentations, that are current respecting it. And I pray the great Head of the Church that His blessing may rest upon it just so far as it is calculated to promote the cause of truth.

W. GOODE.

31, Charterhouse Square,
March 21, 1849.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The kindness with which the former Edition of this Work has been received, and the early call for another Edition, render it unnecessary for the Author to offer more than a very few remarks in this place. He desires, however, to express his thankfulness at the reception given to the Work, as it encourages him to hope that it may be of use, with God's blessing, for the promotion of the cause of truth, and the manifestation of the true doctrine of the Church of England, on the momentous subject of which it treats.

Late events in our Church have given the long-standing controversy among us on this point a more than ordinary degree of importance. The attempt has been made to force upon the Church, as a standard of faith, an interpretation of her Services which would place them in direct antagonism to the doctrine of the very men who drew them up, and to eject from her ministry all who hold a different view. It was quite time, therefore, that the claims of such an interpretation should be fully investigated, and the true doctrine of our Church set forth and proved. To do this, is the object of the following Work. And while it fully investigates the important and conclusive internal evidence afforded on the subject by our Formularies themselves, the Author has more especially directed his attention to what may be called the historical part of the argument. Nothing can more fully show the weakness of the claim set up by those who call themselves "High Churchmen" among us, to the exclusive admissibility of their interpretation of our Book of Common Prayer, than the fact of its contrariety to the doctrine of our Reformers and early divines. To say nothing of the sentiments of those who drew up the Prayer Book of Edward VI., the notorious facts that the compilers of the Elizabethan Prayer Book (which, with a few alterations not affecting the present question, is that now in use) were, of *what is called* the "Calvinistic" School, and that the Primate who first issued and earnestly pressed the Canon for subscription to the Prayer Book was a High "Calvinist" (Archbishop Whitgift), ought to silence forever the assertion that a "Calvinist" cannot consistently subscribe to that Book. And if a "Calvinist" can without difficulty subscribe to it, then certainly it does not assert that spiritual regeneration is the universal and unconditional effect of Baptism in all infants.

And here lies the importance of the historical argument in elucidating the meaning of our Formularies. We do not point to the "Calvinism" of our early divines as showing that a Calvinistic interpretation *must* be given to our Formularies, or as identifying a denial of the "High Church" doctrine as to the effects of Baptism with Calvinistic views,—for Arminians are found equally denying it,—but we adduce the fact of the "Calvinistic" doctrine of those to whom we are indebted for our Formularies as irrefragable evidence against the attempt made to fix upon those Formularies an *exclusive* interpretation, framed by men of a directly opposite school.

Apart from any consideration of the peculiar circumstances under which the subject is now discussed in our Church, it is impossible to overrate its importance as connected with sound views of doctrine on other points. False views as to the effects of Baptism in the case of infants introduce confusion and error into the whole system of doctrine connected with them. If it is supposed that the Clergy can dispense God's grace and the best blessing of the Gospel Covenant to anybody they please in infancy, there is an end to all sound theology. The doctrines of the necessity of God's gift of prevenient grace, and justification by faith, as laid down in our 10th and 11th Articles, are almost nullified. And the whole scheme of doctrine embraced, partakes of the consequences of this primary false principle on which it is built.

One effect however may result from the present controversy, and the consequence be of great benefit, if it please God, to the interests of truth in our Church, namely, that the minds of men will be more drawn to the importance of sound and clear views on this subject.

The present Edition of this Work has been carefully revised throughout. I must add, however, that I have certainly found no reason at present, from any remarks made on the Work, to withdraw or alter a single position, argument or authority, advanced in it. A few additional remarks and authorities will be found interspersed here and there; and a translation has been given of the Latin quotations. The latter forms the major part of the matter added.

It remains only for the Author again to commend it to the Divine blessing.

W. GOODE.

31, Charter House Square,
Dec. 7, 1849.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

page

PRELIMINARY REMARKS . . . . . 1—26

CHAPTER II.

ON THE VIEWS OF SOME OF THE EARLIER SCHOLASTIC DIVINES . . . . . 27—37

CHAPTER III.

ON THE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY TO WHICH OUR REFORMERS AND EARLY DIVINES BELONGED . . 38—142

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE CONFESSIONS OF THE FOREIGN PROTESTANT CHURCHES AND DIVINES RESPECTING THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM . . . . . 143—161

CHAPTER V.

THE DOCTRINE OF MARTIN BUCER AND PETER MARTYR, (WHO WERE PLACED BY ARCHBISHOP CRANMER, AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI., AS THE FIRST REGIUS PROFESSORS OF DIVINITY AT CAMBRIDGE AND OXFORD,) ON THE SUBJECT OF THE EFFECTS OF INFANT BAPTISM . . . . . 162—178

§ 1. The doctrine of Martin Bucer . . . . 162—174

§ 2. The doctrine of Peter Martyr . . . . 174—178

page

CHAPTER VI.

On the character of the Works issued by public authority in the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII., and their doctrine on the subject of the effects of Baptism in Infants . . . 179—207

CHAPTER VII.

The doctrine of our leading Reformers and Divines during the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, and the earlier part of that of James I., on the subject of the effects of Baptism in Infants . . . . . 208—389

During the reign of Edward VI.:—

Testimonies of Catechism of 1553 (p. 209);—Abp. Cranmer (211);—Bp. Ridley (225);—Bp. Latimer (226);—Bp. Hooper (227);—John Bradford (231);—Archdeacon Philpot (238);—Bp. Coverdale (239);—Thomas Becon (240);—Dean Turner (242);—Lancelot Ridley (243);—John Olde (243);—Roger Hutchinson (244);—Short Catechism, 1550 (245). . . 209—246

During the reigns of Elizabeth and James I.:—

Testimonies of Works having public sanction:—Bishop Jewell's Apology, &c. (p. 246);—Dean Nowell's Catechism (254);—Bullinger's Decads (262) . . . . . 246—274

Testimonies of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Regius and Margaret Professors of Divinity at Cambridge and Oxford:—Abp. Whitgift (275);—Abp. Sandys (278);—Bp. R. Abbot (278);—Bp. J. Prideaux (285);—Bp. Westfaling (287);—Dr. Calfhill (291);—Dr. Benefield (291);—Dr. Whitaker (293);—Bp. Davenant (300) . . . 274—308

Testimonies of various other Bishops:—Bp. Geste (308);—Bp. Alley (310);—Bp. Cooper (311):—Bp. Babington (315);—Bp. Bridges (319);—Bp. W. Barlow (322);—Bp. L. Andrews (326);—Bp. Parry (330);—Bp. Lake (330);—Bp. Carleton (334); Bp. Downame (338);—Abp. Usher (342);—Bp. Bedell (349) . . . . . 308—356

page

Testimonies of learned Divines and Laymen:—Dr. W. Haddon (356);—Dr. R. Some (359);—Dr. Prime (364);—Dr. Fulke (366);—R. Hooker (368);—Dr. A. Willet (372);—T. Rogers (380);—Dr. Sparke (383);—Lord Chancellor Bacon (385) . . . . . 356—389

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, AND THE BOOK OF HOMILIES, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK . . . . . 390—412

§ 1. The doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles . . 390—406

§ 2. The doctrine of the Book of Homilies . . 406—412

CHAPTER IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK . . . . . 413—456

§ 1. Examination of the Baptismal Services for infants, and proof of the principle on which they are constructed, by a comparison of them with the other Services in the Book of Common Prayer . . . . . 413—428

§ 2. The judgment of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, upon our Baptismal Services for infants . . . . 428—432

§ 3. Luther's Service for Infant Baptism expressed in similar terms to ours, and understood by him in the hypothetical sense 432—435

§ 4. The meaning of the Baptismal Service demonstrated by a comparison of it with a similar Formulary, drawn up by Bucer himself, in a Liturgy from which our own Office is admitted to be "freely borrowed." . . . . . 435—456

CHAPTER X.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATECHISM ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK . . . . . 457—476

CHAPTER XI.

ON THE SAVOY CONFERENCE, AND THE SUBSEQUENT REVIEW AND RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOOK OF

page

Common Prayer by Convocation and Parliament in 1662 . . . . . 477—482

CHAPTER XII.

Testimonies from our Divines since the Restoration, chiefly of the Arminian School, on the subject of this Work; and concluding remarks 483—528

Testimonies from Bp. W. Nicolson (p. 485); Bp. Jeremy Taylor (486); Bp. Hopkins (488); Bp. Pearson (492); Dean Durel (494); Dr. W. Falkner (497); Bp. Burnet (500); Abp. Tillotson (502); Abp. Sharp (503); Bp. John Williams (503); W. Burkitt (504); Dr. T. Bray (505); Bp. T. Wilson (507); Bp. Beveridge (507); Joseph Bingham (512); Bp. Bradford (514); Chancellor Stebbing (516); Thomas Stackhouse (518); Abp. Secker (519); Bp. Edm. Law (521); Bp. Horsley (522); Bp. Barrington (523) . . . . . 485—523

Concluding Remarks . . . . . 523—528

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

Luther's Form for the Baptism of Infants, according to the second edition published by him in German in 1524, and translated and published in Latin in 1526 . . . . . 529—532

No. 2.

The Order and Form of Baptism (including the Prefatory Remarks on the subject of Baptism) inserted in the Brandenburg and Nuremberg Liturgy of 1533 . . . . . 533—542

No. 3.

The Forms and Orders for Baptism and Confirmation, with the accompanying observations, drawn up and inserted by Bucer, in the Liturgical work published in 1543, by Herman, Archbishop of Cologne . . . . . 542—566

Addenda, &c. . . . . 566 ad fin.

DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS TO THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM IN INFANTS.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

The remarks contained in the following pages are intentionally confined to the discussion of the question, *What is the doctrine of the Church of England as to the effects of baptism in the case of infants?*

In treating this subject, I shall argue it quite independently of the further question,—Whether the XXXIX Articles are, or are not, the supreme standard of faith and test of orthodoxy for the ministers of our Church in those points treated of in them,—and shall endeavour to show the sense of our Formularies, both from internal testimony, and as illustrated by the writings of our divines from the period of their construction.

Before I proceed, however, to the regular discussion of the subject, I would offer a few preliminary remarks tending to illustrate the real character of the question, and to show *how far* a definite and certain solution of it is to be expected. It appears to me that erroneous views are often entertained on this point. The matter is frequently spoken of as if the Church of England must of necessity have laid down, and had in fact laid down, a certain definite precise view upon this subject, and peremptorily enjoined it upon all her ministers for their acceptance and belief. In my humble apprehension such a notion is entirely opposed to fact, and also to the well-known principles upon which our Reformers were guided in drawing up the Formularies of our Church. As our Reformers have not bound us to one precise

human system of theology, so they have not, in my belief, tied us to one precise view of the subject we are now about to discuss, and the parties who are the loudest in clamouring for the establishment of their view as the exclusive doctrine of our Church, are probably *the farthest from the doctrine of our Reformers*; even to the transgression of the *limits* which they certainly did not intend to be overstepped.

The way in which some parties are in the habit of putting forward their view on this subject as precisely and definitely the exclusive view of the Church of England, to be held by all her ministers on the pain of incurring the charge of dishonesty and being driven with disgrace from her communion, forcibly reminds one of the tone assumed by one of their late leaders when advocating his system as the doctrine of the Fathers. In his opinion (and he, we were told, was one of the most learned theologians and patristical scholars in our Church, if not supreme among them) there was no room for argument on the subject. That his system was established as the truth by the Catholic consent of all the Fathers, was "an *obvious fact*,"* about which in impartial minds there could not be any doubt. But somehow or other, in the course of a *very* few years, the "obvious fact" was found out to be a delusion; the produce of a one-sided interpretation of a few passages from certain authors favourable to the doctrine which had engaged his affections. And so this very learned patristical scholar, who was to have enlightened all England by showing them how "everybody always everywhere," for many centuries from the first foundation of the Christian Church, had maintained "Church principles," was cut short in his course by the awkward "fact" that he had made a great mistake, and that there was no such consent. But alas! "Church principles" were too precious to be abandoned, and therefore (wisely upon his view of the subject) he adopted the principles that come nearest to them, and in some points appear to approximate very closely to them; and passed over to a party where the trouble of further doubt, argument, or research, is rendered wholly unnecessary, and an infallible determination bids every scruple cease and every tongue be silent.

---

* See Newman's Lectures on Romanism and Popular Protestantism, *passim*.

I will not anticipate such a result from an endeavour to prove that the statements of certain parties as to the doctrine of our Church on the subject we are now considering, are as idle and groundless as Mr. Newman's claims for his "obvious fact." But the assertions seem to me so remarkably similar in character and origin, that the remembrance of the one came forcibly into my mind when about to offer some remarks on the other.

Now, as I have already intimated, it appears to me, after long and anxious consideration of the question here proposed for discussion, that all which our Church has done upon this question is, to lay down certain *limits* on both sides, within which the views of her ministers are to be confined.

At the beginning of the Reformation in Germany, several of the Continental Reformers, offended with the grossly corrupt doctrine of the Church of Rome on the subject, maintained (or at least used language which seemed to imply) that the Sacraments were *mere* signs, not having any peculiarly promised gift of grace attached to them, even in the case of the most worthy recipients. This view seems rather implied, even by Melancthon, in the earliest edition of his "Loci Theologici," published in 1521, under the title of "Hypotyposes Theologicæ,"* a work which underwent very great alterations in subsequent years at the hands of its author, partly in this point, and more especially in some others. But Luther, apparently from the very first, took a higher view of the value of the Sacraments *in the case of faithful recipients*. And the language of Melancthon (though to the last cautious and guarded) soon became similar to his on the subject. The difference of language, however, between Luther and some of his friends on one side, and Bucer and others of the Reformers on the other, upon this point, was one of the subjects of discussion in a Conference held between Luther, Melancthon, and others, as representatives of one party, and Bucer, Musculus, and others, as representatives of the other, at Wittemberg in 1536, in which, after mutual explanations, the parties present came to a full understanding on the point, and each side agreed to withdraw expressions tending to the undue exaltation or de-

* The Chapter on the Sacraments is entitled "De Signis." The original edition is of great rarity, but it has been reprinted in Von der Hardt, Hist. Liter. Reform., and lately republished separately in Germany.

preciation of the Sacrament of Baptism. An account of this Conference is to be found in Bucer's "Scripta Anglicana."* And in the same year Bucer published a new edition of his Commentaries on the Gospels, containing a "retractation" of some passages on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which had appeared in his previous edition of 1530.† The concessions made by Bucer and his party upon this occasion were not altogether grateful to the whole Protestant body; but the ground taken in this Conference upon the subject, certainly became the prevailing view among the Continental Reformers, especially in their public Confessions. I purpose hereafter to revert to it.

Now, upon this point, as we might expect, our Church has spoken decidedly. In her 27th Article she declares, (and requires her clergy to maintain,) that "Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened; but is also a sign of regeneration or new birth,"—and that not an empty, but efficacious sign—"whereby, as by an instrument, they that RECEIVE BAPTISM RIGHTLY, are grafted into the Church, &c. . . . . *Faith is confirmed; and grace increased* by virtue of prayer unto God." Our Church thus repudiates the doctrine of those who hold baptism to be a *mere* sign, and pronounces that a certain definite gift and blessing are attached to it in those that *rightly receive it*. Here, then, is the limit on one side.

But on the other side, there were those, namely, the Romanists, who maintained that baptism conferred grace upon all to whom it was given, even *ex opere operato*, that is, from the performance of the act; in case there was no direct obstacle opposed to its reception by the party baptized.

So it was laid down in the Council of Trent.

"If any one shall maintain, that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they represent, or that they do not confer the grace itself upon those who do not place an obstacle in the way; as if they were only external signs of a grace or righteousness received through faith, and certain marks of Christian pro-

---

* Buceri Scripta Anglicana. Basil. 1577, fol. pp. 648–669.

† Buceri in Sacra Quatuor Evangelia Enarrationes. Basil. 1536. fol. pp. 42–45; and 185–187: 566, 567.

fession, by which, in the sight of men, the faithful are distinguished from the unfaithful, let him be anathema."*

"If any one shall maintain, that grace is not conferred by the Sacraments of the New Law themselves from the work performed, but that faith in the divine promise is alone sufficient to obtain grace, let him be anathema."†

These statements are drawn up in the style too common among the Romanists. Their own views are first stated, and then contrasted with a *misrepresentation* of those of their opponents. What we are concerned with, however, is the statement of their own doctrine; and this is, clearly, that the Sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato* on all who do not place an impediment in the way. The nature of this "impediment" has been variously stated, and the Council has certainly left it doubtful what in their view was its precise character. But in whatever way the words may be explained, they are clearly contrary to the doctrine of our Church, as expressed in the 25th Article. "In *such only as worthily receive the same* [*i. e.* the Sacraments], they have *a wholesome effect or operation.* But they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith." And in the corresponding Article of 1552, the very phrase, *ex opere operato,* was expressly repudiated in strong language of disapprobation, the clause running thus:—"And in such only, as worthily receive the same, they have an wholesome effect and operation, *and yet not that of the work wrought, as some men speak, which word, as it is strange and unknown to Holy Scripture, so it engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious sense.*‡ But they that receive the Sacraments unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith."

---

* Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam quam significant; aut *gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre;* quasi signa tantum externa sint acceptæ per fidem gratiæ, vel justitiæ, et notæ quædam Christianæ professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus; anathema sit. (Sess. vii. Can. 6. Ed. Streitwolf, Gotting. 1838, vol. 1. p. 39.)

† Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta *ex opere operato* non *conferri gratiam,* sed solam fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere; anathema sit." (Ib. Can. 8. Ed. Streitwolf, Gotting. 1838, vol. 1. p. 39.)

‡ Idque non ex opere (ut quidam loquuntur) operato, quæ vox ut peregrina est et sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium, sed admodum superstitiosum. (Ed. Cardwell.)

In the revision in 1562, the whole Article was re-cast, and the words in italics omitted; no doubt as unnecessary, for as Bishop Burnet says in his Commentary on the Article, "In all this diversity there is no real difference; for the virtue of the Sacraments being put in the worthy receiving, excludes the doctrine of *Opus operatum* as formally as if it had expressly been condemned." And certainly those engaged in the revision of the Articles in 1562, were little likely to take a view more favourable to the Romish doctrine in this or in any other point, than those that drew up the Articles of 1552. One of them, the author of the Apology, Bishop Jewell, may be allowed to speak for all. "We say," (he remarks in his Apology, a work the high authority of which the Bishop of Exeter acknowledges,) "that the Sacraments of Christ, *without faith,* do *not once profit those that be alive,* a great deal less do they profit those that be dead." (Ch. 15, div. 2. In Def. of Apology, in his Works, p. 282. ed. 1611.) And in his "Reply to Harding's Answer" to his Sermon, he expressly opposes the Roman doctrine of *Opus operatum,* as maintained in the eighth Canon of the seventh Session of the Council of Trent (above cited), and other passages in Romish writers. (Works, Reply, p. 437, &c.)

The same doctrine is also clearly maintained in the 26th, 28th, and 29th Articles. In the first of these, where it is stated that "the grace of God's gifts" is not "diminished from such as by *faith and rightly* do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them." In the 28th and 29th, where it is stated that "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive" the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the bread is "a partaking of the Body of Christ," and the wine "a partaking of the Blood of Christ," while the "wicked" in receiving are "in no wise partakers of Christ."

Here, then, is a distinct limit laid down by our Church on the doctrine of the Sacraments on the Romish side, drawing a clear line of separation between us and Rome on the subject.

And here I feel bound to remark, that the Bishop of Exeter, in his recent Charge, has *clearly and expressly transgressed this limit.* He has there ventured to state, (I quote from the *third* edition) that "at the time when the Articles were first compiled, in 1552, and even ten years afterwards, when they assumed their

present form, the point on which of all others there was the least of difference either between us, or even the German Protestants, and Rome, was the doctrine of Baptism." (p. 10.) And that "by the Sacraments *ex opere operato* grace is conferred, may be affirmed, if it be understood, that it is *God who worketh* by them." (p. 11, *note*.) And that on the subject of Baptism "we are agreed" with Rome. (p. 11.)

It is difficult to conceive, how such a statement could have been ventured upon, but by one whose station seemed likely to protect him from being called to account for it. The very Articles of 1552, to which his Lordship here refers as favouring his views, repudiate in express terms (as we have just seen) the doctrine he has laid down, stating (in opposition to the Canon of the Council of Trent, passed in 1547), that the Sacraments have not their effect *ex opere operato*, and denouncing the phrase as "engendering no godly but a *very superstitious* sense." And the same is the meaning of the Article as it now stands; for, essentially, it remains the same; nor will the Bishop, I suppose, himself assert, that any real difference was intended on this point by the divines who revised the Article in 1562.

Equally unfortunate is his Lordship's reference to Jewell in defence of the doctrine he has here advanced; for, as we have just seen, Jewell expressly repudiates it. I shall notice his Lordship's extracts from Jewell, when I come to consider Jewell's testimony more at length. But I would here remark, that the Bishop's mistake with respect to his testimony has arisen precisely in the same way as his mistake (now acknowledged in the second and subsequent editions of his Charge), with respect to the Confessions of the Reformed Churches. He has deduced from Jewell's general statements of the effect of the Sacraments, when their full end and purpose are answered, the unwarranted inference, that he asserts that such effects are *always* produced, whenever they are administered. By this mode of reasoning he has (as I pointed out in my "Vindication," in reply to his Charge) adduced as an unanswerable proof that Dean Nowell's Catechism supports his view, a passage taken from *Calvin*. And by a similar process he might convert every author who ever held that the Sacraments, when worthily received, were accompanied by a gift of grace suitable to their character, into a de-

fender of his views. In a word, he confounds the doctrine of the efficacy of the Sacraments as held by the Reformers, subject to the condition of the suitability and worthiness of the recipient, in the eye of God, with the *opus operatum* doctrine of the Romanists, in which the grace of God is so tied to the administration of the Sacraments, that where the one is, there must of necessity be the other.

The great difference between the two, may be seen at once by a reference to two authors, whom the Bishop himself will, I suppose, admit to be far enough from holding his view.

Thus the learned W. Whitaker (whose testimony I shall consider at large hereafter) says,—

"What, therefore, do we say? Do we take away all grace from the Sacraments? Far be it from us; although they [the Romanists] misrepresent us as so doing. For we say that they are *most efficacious instruments of the Holy Spirit, and are also instrumental causes of grace:* and this they also say; but *we say it in one sense, they in another.*"*

So also even Perkins,—

"Of the efficacy of the Sacraments. 1. We teach and believe that the Sacraments are signs to represent Christ with his benefits unto us. 2. We teach further, that *the Sacraments are indeed instruments whereby God offereth and giveth the foresaid benefits unto us. Thus far we consent with the Roman Church.*" (Reformed Catholic, Pt. 19. Wks. 1616. Vol. 1. p. 610.)

His Lordship may see from these passages, that the language which he seems to think conclusive in favour of his views, is freely used by authors who are entirely opposed to it. It has not the meaning he wishes to derive from it.

We hold as much as the Bishop does the value and efficacy of baptism as God's ordinance, and have no difficulty in using corresponding language respecting it. But we speak of the ordinance as it is when received by one upon whom God pleases to bestow his blessing in it. And be it remembered, that all general

* Quid ergo nos dicimus? omnemne a sacramentis gratiam removemus? absit; etsi illi quidem de nobis sic mentiuntur. Dicimus enim esse efficacissima organa Spiritus Sancti, et esse causas etiam instrumentales gratiæ: et hoc illi etiam dicunt; sed aliter illi, aliter nos. (Whitak. Prælect. de Sacram. Francof. 1624. 4to., p. 62.)

statements as to the efficacy of baptism, apply as much to the case of adults as to that of infants. And as in the case of adults, such language is used only on the hypothesis that they come to baptism with a right mind, in faith and repentance; so in the case of infants, we have no right to suppose that all are equally acceptable in the sight of God.

But, to return to our subject, we see from the remarks made above, that our Church has clearly laid down a *limit* on each side of the question as to the effects of baptism. And beyond this she certainly has not gone in her Articles. Whether her other Formularies narrow these limits, is a question which shall be discussed hereafter; when I shall also reply to the attempt made to strain some of the XXXIX Articles to a "High Church" and Popish sense.

But I notice the fact (as I must be permitted for the present to assume it to be) here, in order to point attention to the circumstance, that between these limits there are *various shades of doctrine*, especially as it respects the case of infant-baptism, which have, probably, from the first, been more or less maintained in our Church. And I think it will conduce to a clear understanding of the nature and difficulties of the subject with many readers, if I make here a few observations on the various views that have prevailed among us on the point. No man sitting down calmly and impartially to examine the matter, can fail to see, that there are many complex and difficult questions to be determined, in pronouncing upon the effects of infant-baptism, on which our Church has given no decision, and on which our divines have been obviously divided in opinion, and which materially affect the judgment to be given.

Nor is this surprising, when we consider how careful our Church has been of tying up her members beyond the doctrines clearly laid down in the word of God; and that Holy Scripture has nowhere expressly and *nominatim* determined the precise effects of *infant* baptism.

It must be carefully remembered, that as the doctrine of infant baptism is deduced inferentially, and by analogical reasoning, from statements of Scripture applying more expressly to the case of adult baptism, so the doctrine of the *effects* of infant baptism can be obtained only in the same way. Now as we deduce

without difficulty, in one case, the *fact*, that baptism is to be administered; so, in the other, we, with equal certainty, deduce the fact, that there is, *under corresponding circumstances*, a blessing given to the child similar to that given to the adult. But the question is (and here lies the difficulty), what these corresponding circumstances are.

In the case of an adult, our Church distinctly requires the existence of faith and repentance in the party coming to baptism; and maintains that in such only as *worthily* receive the Sacraments, they have a wholesome effect or operation. (Art. 25, 26, and 27.) In adults, therefore, certain qualifications are indispensably required, in order to their being made partakers of the full baptismal blessing.

But, in proceeding from their case to that of an infant, it is obvious, that we have got one of a very different kind to deal with, but still one in which we must reason by analogy, from the former, as to the grounds upon which baptism is administered, and the effects produced by it. For the declarations of Holy Scripture on this subject had more especial reference, in their first application, to the case of adults.

It is unnecessary here to enter upon the question of the title of infants, *as* infants, to baptism, because that is fully granted on both sides.

But it is an important inquiry, to *what* infants that title belongs. For not *all*, even in the sight of man, can be considered as fit subjects for that holy rite.

What infants are proper subjects for baptism? Are the children of infidels fit subjects? Will it be said that if we went into heathen countries and baptized by force or stealth the children of the heathen, such baptism would certainly be attended with the gift of regenerating grace? If baptism is followed by such a salutary effect, even *ex opere operato*, this cannot be denied. But will any one gravely maintain that this is the doctrine of our Church? It is not indeed anywhere (as far as I remember) distinctly laid down in any of the Formularies of the Church, that the children of infidels are not admissible to baptism. But is it not clearly implied? *so* implied, that baptism administered to them is not warranted by our Church? Supposing a case where by force or stealth an infant of heathen

parents was brought, even with the required sureties, for baptism, would any minister of our Church feel justified in performing the rite? What does Jewell's Apology—a very high, though not legally binding authority—say respecting baptism? "We say that Baptism is a Sacrament of the remission of sins, and of that washing which we have in the blood of Christ; and that no person which will profess Christ's name, ought to be restrained or kept back therefrom—no, not the very babes of CHRISTIANS; *forasmuch as* they be born in sin, *and do pertain unto the people of God.*" (Ch. ii. div. 3, Works, p. 216.) The administration of the Sacrament is here clearly limited to the babes of "Christians," and they are to be baptized *on the ground* that they "*pertain unto the people of God.*" The same doctrine is clearly laid down in Nowell's Catechism, where it is said, "Cum infantes *nostros vim et quasi substantiam Baptismi communem nobiscum habere certum sit,* illis injuria fieret, si signum, quod veritate est inferius, ipsis negaretur . . . . Itaque æquissimum est, ut parvulis *nostris* Divinæ gratiæ, atque salutis *fidelium semini promissæ* hæredes se esse, Baptismo, impresso quasi sigillo, testatum fiat."

The authority of these works confessedly stands so high, that it is hardly necessary to give further references on the subject. The same ground, however, (I will just remark) is taken by Bishop Beveridge in his Exposition of the 27th Article.

In fact, the argument from Scripture for infant baptism is founded very much upon texts which apply only to the children of Christians. Thus the chief Scriptural ground on which it is placed is the text, "The promise is unto you and your children." (Acts ii. 39.) And one of its best supports is St. Paul's statement, that the children of a believing parent are in a certain sense "holy." (1 Cor. vii. 14.)

Here, then, we have at once (if the question respecting the baptism of children of infidels is determined in the negative) an important element in our determination of the question of the effects of infant baptism. We see the necessity of inquiring whether the child is the offspring of parents who are at least professedly Christians. If not, we are not entitled to expect a salutary effect from the ordinance. *Our Service for Infant Baptism, therefore, is drawn up on the* HYPOTHESIS *that the infant is*

the child of at least one (really, or at any rate nominally) *believing parent.*

Hence, the *principle* of the *hypothetical* interpretation of the Service *must* be admitted. As it is *supposed,* in the Service for Adult Baptism, that those who come to be baptized come truly possessed of the qualifications of faith and repentance, so it is *supposed,* in that for Infant Baptism, that the infants brought are at least the children of one professedly Christian parent.

But having proceeded thus far, it is obvious that another question arises. If we are not entitled to reckon upon a salutary effect in baptism in the case of the infant of infidel parents, are we entitled to do so in the case of the infant of mere *nominal* believers? Those who come *as* believers, must, indeed, be *treated by man* as real believers, (unless the falsehood of the profession be patent and canonically provable); but *will He who searcheth the hearts act as if they were so?* Baptism must be administered by us to their children as to the children of real believers, but have we any right to affirm that those children will be dealt with by God as the children of real believers, when their parents are destitute of genuine faith? God *may,* doubtless, give his blessing; but is not the recognised *title* to baptism really, though not apparently, wanting? Here is a question not decided by the Church, and which probably admits of argument. But it is at least reasonable to think, that our Church, administering baptism on the grounds stated by Jewell and Nowell, administers it on the *supposition* that the *professed* belief is a reality; and consequently that her Service is constructed on *this hypothesis.*

Here therefore we have at least a probable reason for *extending* the *hypothesis* on which the Service is constructed.

But we have further to enquire, whether there is any Scriptural ground for supposing, that *all* infants of even a truly believing parent, must necessarily receive the full baptismal blessing when brought to the font. The answer must be that there is not. And consequently we must further consider, in what cases we have reason to expect that blessing, and thus *extend* somewhat further the *hypothesis* on which the thanksgiving in the Service is offered for that blessing.

Here again there is of course some variety of opinion.

Many might be inclined to think, that all infants of a true believer receive in baptism a spiritual blessing, so far that it is to them a seal of the remission of original sin, and therefore that, as infants, they may be said to be regenerated by it.

The faith of the parent is to the infant, *as an infant*, and so far as concerns original sin, mercifully reckoned by God as imputable to the infant, and on the strength of this it is baptized, faith and baptism together (as in the case of adults) perfecting the work of *infantine* regeneration. And (whether this view is preferred or not), I know not why any one should quarrel with the term infantine *regeneration*, in this sense, more than with the Apostolic term infantine *holiness* used in a similar sense. All the objections that could be raised from Scripture against the one, might (barring the passage of the Apostle just referred to) be raised against the other. If we can justly call the children of every true believer *holy*, we can as justly, after they have received the seal of the covenant in baptism, call them *regenerate*. And the Service for Infant Baptism would then be used precisely in the same sense as that for Adult Baptism *must* be used to make it consistent with the 25th Article.

But then comes a further question as to what this regeneration is, and whether one who may have been rightly called regenerate as an infant is therefore to be so considered as an adult. Clearly not; because, by the word of God, personal faith is essential to the regeneration of an adult. The child, in passing from an infantine state to a state of responsibility, goes through a complete change of condition.

And this is the view of the Bishop of Exeter's own referee, Dr. Jackson. His Lordship has triumphantly adduced Dr. Jackson, (Charge, p. 20), as maintaining his own doctrine, because he affirms the universal regeneration of the infants brought to baptism; that is (be it remembered) the infants of those who profess to be true believers. But his Lordship has here merely caught up a few words (apparently taken at second hand from some quarter where he found the quotation, for no reference is given*) from an author of whose real doctrine he is wholly ignorant. For Dr. Jackson expressly says,—

* The passage occurs in his Work on the Creed, Book xi. c. 17, Works iii. 471.

"The same measure of regeneration which sufficeth children, or infants dying before they come to the use of reason, will not suffice such as attain to the use of reason or years of discretion." (Works, iii. 100.)

This view was also advocated by the learned Bishop Davenant, as I shall show elsewhere.

Now I pass no judgment upon this view, but I notice it as one clearly maintainable in our Church, and defended moreover by one to whom the Bishop of Exeter himself refers as a theologian of the highest order among us.

The expressions of many of our divines seem to me strongly to favour this view, though they have not so distinctly expressed it as Dr. Jackson.

But I must add, that no man has any right to stretch the Rubric as to the undoubted salvation of all baptized infants dying in their infancy, so as to include any other than the infants of professing Christians. Children are baptized in our Church as the children of believers, as our early divines constantly affirm; and therefore all statements on the subject of their baptism must be interpreted on that *supposition*. And further, it is clearly *open* to us to maintain, that such a profession must be a reality, to obtain any blessing from God. Man must indeed treat it as a reality, but God is not to be thus mocked.

Others, however, have not been satisfied, that such a distinction can properly be drawn between infant regeneration and adult regeneration; and (still within the limits prescribed by our Church) they have adopted other views, of which the three principal appear to me to be the following. The first is this.—

That the efficaciousness of baptism in infants depends upon previous election by God to salvation; those inclined to Calvinistic views, holding such election to be a free act of sovereign mercy; and those inclined to Arminian views, holding it to proceed from foreseen faith and holiness.*

* This *mode* of interpreting the Baptismal Service *may* be adopted by the Arminian as well as the Calvinist; for the difference between the two does not concern the *existence* of such a thing as divine election and predestination, but the *cause* of them; the former holding it to be the effect of foreseen faith in the predestinated, the latter the effect of a mere gratuitous act of sovereign divine mercy, ultimately producing faith. True, the Arminian holds, that the same degree of grace is given to all; while the Calvinist holds, that more is given to some than to others. But both

In such cases, it is held, that baptism, as God's ordinance, is effectual to the incorporation of the baptized into the true Church—the true Body of Christ. The pardon of original sin is sealed to the child of a believer, and the infant becomes truly a member of Christ's Body, and therefore may truly be called regenerate. Such a child may, when an adult, display for a time little or no evidence of his membership; and as long as this is the case, instead of telling him that he is certainly regenerate, because baptized, we must warn him that there is every reason to fear that he is unregenerate, and uninterested in the blessings of the Covenant; and it is by such exhortations that we may hope to be instrumental, in God's hand, in the accomplishment of that internal change which is to be effected in him.

And in the absence of any evidence to the contrary (as must be the case with infants), it is held, that we are bound in the judgment of charity to regard the infant brought for baptism as one so elected to salvation.

The second view is of a somewhat similar nature, but irrespective of any consideration of the doctrine of Election. It is this:—

That as in adults the efficaciousness of baptism depends upon the party coming to that ordinance in the spirit of true faith and repentance, so in infants (excepting the case of those who die in their infancy, where such qualifications are not required) the efficaciousness of baptism depends upon the prevision by God of future faith and repentance in the child at a subsequent period of life. This view seems clearly implied in those words of Bishop Hooper, where he says,—"Thus be the infants examined concerning repentance and faith, before they be baptized with water, *at the contemplation of the which faith God purgeth the soul.*"*

In such cases, it may fairly be held, that the guilt of original sin being removed from the child baptized, as the child of a be-

these views of the Arminian, are compatible with the notion, that grace and regeneration are not always and necessarily bestowed in baptism. He is not, by his views as an Arminian, shut up to the conclusion that, even where the Divine prescience foresees, that the grace given will be always and permanently rejected, yet, nevertheless, the grace of regeneration must necessarily be bestowed in the rite of baptism. He may legitimately take the view, that where a good use of the grace given is foreseen, it may be always bestowed at baptism; while in the case of others, equal grace may be given at some period of their lives, but not necessarily at baptism.

* Declaration of Christ and His Office. Early Writings. P. S. Ed. p. 74.

liever, (the vicarious faith of the parent uniting with baptism to produce this result) it is, in *contemplation* of its subsequent faith and repentance, *then promised for it,* made a member of the true Church of Christ, and so regenerate.

This subject has often been illustrated, and I think happily, by the consideration of the case of the purchase of an estate upon certain conditions.

Let us suppose an adult purchasing an estate for a thousand pounds. The seal is affixed to the covenant, when the condition of purchase, the payment of a thousand pounds, is fulfilled. And when the covenant is signed and sealed, and not before, the party purchasing becomes possessed of the estate, and all the privileges and titles it confers.

But suppose an estate purchased by trustees for a minor, on the condition (promised by them as far as they are able to make a promise for him) that when he comes of age he shall pay a thousand pounds, and that so long as that sum remains unpaid it shall not be enjoyed by him. By what name shall we call the interest he has in it while a minor? Can we say that the estate is his? Clearly, in a sense, we may do so. But it is only in a sense, only hypothetically; man knows not whether the agreement made is of any value to the child or not. And in the eye of one who foresees all things, such a covenant, if the terms should never be fulfilled by the child, is *from the first a nullity.*

Now in the case of baptism, the conditions for the reception of its grace are faith and repentance, and the worthiness of the party, even in the case of infants, (supposing them afterwards to reach a responsible age) depends upon the ultimate fulfilment of these conditions. I do not enter now into the discussion, whether the performance of those conditions requires a sovereign and peculiar act of divine grace. That is another question. But what is maintained is, that there is a personal worthiness or suitability required in the infant, corresponding to that required in an adult, in order that baptism should seal up to him the gift of regeneration. If faith and repentance are foreseen, the covenant made in baptism is valid and effectual in the eye of God. It may fairly be held, that the child is made a real member of the true Church of Christ, and more or less therefore a partaker of the Spirit.

This, then, is another view of the case, which may fairly be taken, within the before-mentioned limits. Difficulties may be started respecting it, and so they may to every view of the subject that can be taken. And, no doubt, there will be, to the end of time, a difference of opinion respecting it.

But there is also a third view, which is this,—That as faith and repentance are required in the adult, so they are requisite, in proportion, to the infant, for the reception in baptism of the full blessing of that ordinance; and consequently that there must have been a prevenient act of grace, a "pre-received grace," as our learned Bishop W. Barlow expresses it. Some have described this as truly and properly *faith;* others, as the *seed* or *principle* of faith. And it is important to observe, that this was maintained by Luther, who says that infants are brought to baptism "in this hope and persuasion, that they certainly believe."* This doctrine has not been perpetuated among his followers, who have, in fact, in more than one point, deserted the views of the great leader after whom they are called. But Luther's doctrine it certainly was; and we shall find hereafter that this fact will enable us to obtain an important illustration of the meaning of our Baptismal Service. And I find him followed by one at least of our earliest divines, namely, Lancelot Ridley, made by Cranmer, in 1551, one of the six preachers at Canterbury. Others, as future extracts will shew, prefer adopting the notion of a *seed,* or *principle,* or *habit* of faith, having been implanted in the heart.

Where this gift, then, of divine grace (namely, the possession of faith, or at least a spiritual bias of the mind which may be called a seed or principle of faith) has been bestowed, there (as in the similar case of adults) baptism is efficacious for the fulfilment of its best end and purpose.

All these views are clearly admissible within the limits prescribed by our Church. And all these, we shall find hereafter, have been held by some of our best divines.

But I must add, that to keep within these limits is of the utmost importance; to guard, on the one side, against any con-

* Hac spe atque animo, quod *certò credant.*—(Catechismus Major.)

tempt or neglect of Christ's own ordinance; and, on the other, against the arrogant pretensions of a self-exalting priesthood to confer, on whom they please, gifts which our blessed Lord gives according to his own will; through the instrumentality, indeed, generally of his ministers, but only when, and in whom, he pleases to work through them.

The great (I had almost said fatal) mistake which those who maintain what are called High Church views among us have made on this and other kindred subjects, appears to me to be this,—that they suppose, that because they are ministers of Christ, and that certain ministrations were appointed for certain ends, therefore those ministrations must always be effectual to the accomplishment of those ends. Now it is true that Christ works by them, and works by certain ministrations the ends intended to be fulfilled by them; but *only* when, and in what cases, *He* pleases. They are instruments for fulfilling the purposes of *His* will. Out of every hundred individuals to whom they preach, there may be very few in whose hearts the Spirit works by them. Out of every hundred to whom they administer the Sacraments, there may be very few to whom they minister more than an outward rite or ceremony.

But with this, some will not be satisfied. No, say they,—I have been made a minister of Christ, and thus had power given me to dispense, whenever I please, spiritual influence by the administration of the Sacraments. And the very logical mode of arguing by which this is supported, is, that being duly ordained, their administration of the Sacraments is valid, and that Scripture tells us, that the Sacraments were appointed for such and such ends; and, of course, uses language respecting them appropriate to their proper character and purposes. They that are baptized have put on Christ, says the Apostle. *Therefore,* says the Bishop of Exeter, *whoever* are baptized by me have put on Christ. Most logical conclusion! Let us take another case of such reasoning. They that are instituted and inducted into a living, have obtained legal possession of that living. Therefore, *whoever* are instituted and inducted to a living by the proper authorities for performing such acts, even though it may turn out that they were never ordained, have obtained legal

possession of that living. The fallacy lies in arguing from a general statement, where conditions are tacitly implied, to particular cases in which those conditions are not fulfilled.

In all these views that we have mentioned, it must be observed, there is *one governing principle*, namely, that the doctrine of the effects of infant baptism must correspond (according to the analogy of the two cases) with that of the effects of adult baptism. That infants should enjoy in baptism the full blessing of that holy ordinance, it is necessary that there should be something in their state or circumstances corresponding with that which is required in adults for the attainment of that blessing. And it is the complete præterition of all consideration of the necessity of qualifications in infants for enjoying that blessing, that is (as it appears to me) the grand cause of the mistakes made by many among us, both as to the doctrine itself now in question, and as to the meaning of the language of our divines on the subject of Baptism. When general statements are found in our divines pointing out the value and excellent effects of baptism, they claim them at once as maintaining their view that all infants are spiritually regenerated in baptism. But when we ask, whether they mean, that baptism produces these effects in *all* cases, they are compelled to reply, No, in the case of adults we must suppose that these statements were intended only to apply to *those* adults who have faith and repentance. Why then, I ask, are we not to suppose a similar and analogous limitation implied in the case of infants? And the only answer is, because they choose to think that all infants are alike, or that they adopt the notion (utterly unsanctioned by our Church) that all receive the grace of baptism who do not oppose the obstacle of mortal sin. But this reply is evidently insufficient. It proceeds upon a mere private notion of their own. It is a mere baseless fiction, utterly unsupported by a shred of Scriptural testimony, or the evidence of any document of authority in our Church.

And the requirement by our Church of *sponsors* who shall, previous to the baptism of the child, promise, in its name, faith and repentance when it reaches the age of responsibility, (baptism being administered, *to those likely to reach that age*, only on condition of such promise being made) shows that it sanc-

tions no such notion. Faith and repentance being necessary pre-requisites to the worthy reception of baptism in adults, our Church has deemed it right, that, even in the case of infants, a pledge of the future existence of these dispositions shall, as far as possible, be given; evidently showing that baptism is administered only in *the anticipation* of the subsequent exercise of these dispositions. True; the *validity* of the Sacrament does not depend upon these promises being made; for as Bishop Jewell says, "Whether one, or two, or three, or more, be godfathers, or witnesses of the baptism, it maketh nothing to the virtue of the Sacrament; they are no part thereof; without these baptism is whole and perfect. . .Christ left no order for the use of these things, neither did by his word or example require them."* But, nevertheless, the requirement shows the sense of our Church as to the necessity of subsequent faith and repentance on the part of the child, if it lives to years of responsibility, in order that its baptism may be of any service to it; and that if it could be foreseen, that such faith and repentance would not be exercised by it (as it is by God, where such is the case) *baptism would not be given to it;* for it is given *on this condition and understanding.*

And it is exceedingly important to observe this, because nothing is easier than to bring forward a host of passages from our divines, extolling the effects and value of baptism; and they who tacitly ASSUME that all infants are worthy recipients, though they neither have, nor ever will have, any good motions or feelings in them, at once apply all that is said, to the case of *every* infant baptized, and produce such passages as proofs of what their authors supposed *all* infants to receive in baptism. So completely has the Bishop of Exeter allowed himself to be misled by such passages, as to quote Calvinistic Confessions of Faith as maintaining his doctrine,—affording an irrefragable proof, how completely we may misrepresent the authors of such statements, by interpreting them as favouring such a doctrine.

It may be said, perhaps, that the child is baptized as the child of Christian parents, and brought by Christian sponsors, and that this constitutes its *worthiness* for the blessing of the rite.

---

* Treatise of the Sacraments, p. 267, Works, 1611, fol.

But this is a mere unwarranted assumption. These are requisites to the qualification of the child for baptism. And these are all the qualifications that *man* can demand; and we know, that *among* those thus brought, are some at least who will enjoy the full baptismal blessing. But it does not follow, that these are all the qualifications that *God* requires, or that *he* will look with equal favour upon *all* who are thus brought, even where it is foreknown to him that the party to the day of his death will remain faithless and impenitent. All the infants of the Israelites were to be circumcised; but circumcision was not to *all* of them what it was to Abraham, or even to Isaac and Jacob. It is most important to recollect, that all events, past, present, and future, are simultaneously present to the Divine mind. God is omnipresent in all *time*, as well as in all *space*.

And, I must add, that beyond these considerations touching the state of the infant, our Church clearly teaches us the necessity of prayer to any well-grounded anticipation of obtaining the Divine blessing in the rite of baptism, as much as in any other ordinance; not, indeed, to the validity of the external rite, as a rite, but to *our looking for* the presence and blessing of God in it. God *may*, indeed, be mercifully present to the child in it, but we have no right to assume that such will be the case. This is so clearly laid down in the 27th Article, that by no fair interpretation of the words can it be got rid of. That Article tells us, that in this ordinance "Faith is confirmed, and grace increased *by virtue of prayer unto God*," (*vi invocationis divinæ*). The words, no doubt, apply more immediately to the case of adult baptism, but also, it must be admitted, in their due proportion and analogy, to that of infant baptism. And the Article is supported in this, as I shall show hereafter, by a work drawn up at the same time under Cranmer's eye and supervision, called the "Reformatio Legum."

There is another point, also, which it is of the greatest importance to observe in connexion with this subject. And that is, *what the full baptismal blessing is*. For it might be supposed, from the language used by some parties on this subject, that not even the slightest interest in the favour of God, or any spiritual change, can be enjoyed till the moment of baptism. A more unscriptural notion could not be entertained. In *all* cases,

baptism is connected with regeneration only as the formal signing and sealing of the deed is connected with the completion of a purchase. This follows necessarily from the fact, that faith and repentance are required (either in person or by promise) from *all* who *come* to baptism, and that in Holy Scripture these are described as essential characteristics of regeneration. Consequently, in adults, the internal work of regeneration must be at least commenced before parties can properly receive baptism; and, in infants, it must either be commenced, or foreseen by God certainly to follow.

But baptism is the formal act of incorporation into Christ's body, the Church; not merely the visible Church, but (when God acts in the ordinance) the true Church, the mystical body of Christ. And therefore it may justly be said, that, where it is efficacious, there we are regenerated by it. For whereas, before, we were only the children of Adam, and so of wrath; we are hereby made children of grace, members of Christ. But it must be remembered, that as in the natural birth there was life previously; so in the spiritual new birth, life, a living principle of faith, must have been implanted to make the birth by baptism effectual to the production of a being spiritually alive. And Holy Scripture, clearly, often speaks of the implantation of this principle of spiritual life as the act of regeneration, inasmuch as it is the most important part of the work of spiritual new-birth.* While it also speaks of that new-birth as connected with baptism, but evidently in the sense just mentioned. And if this easy distinction is kept in view, all the passages of Holy Scripture on the subject harmonize fully with one another.

It is also to be borne in mind, that as spiritual regeneration is thus connected with baptism, which is its sign and seal, there is a sense in which all that are baptized may be called by man regenerate; not as having beyond doubt received spiritual regeneration, but as having received the Sacrament of Regeneration, and thus being sacramentally regenerate; and the Sacrament also is called by the name of that of which it is a sign.

Thus Augustine says,—

"For if Sacraments had not a certain likeness of those things

* See John iii. 12–15; Eph. ii. 21; James i. 18; 1 Pet. i. 23; 1 John iii. 9; v. 1 and 4.

of which they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. But from this similarity for the most part they receive the names even of the things themselves. As therefore in a certain way the sacrament of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith."*

And elsewhere ;

"Inasmuch as we say that he was baptized in Christ, we admit that he has put on Christ ; and if we admit this we admit that he is regenerate . . . But men put on Christ, sometimes as far as the reception of the sacrament goes, sometimes beyond that even to the sanctification of the life : and the first of these may be common both to the good and the evil, but the other is peculiar to the good and the pious."†

I ought however to remark, before I bring this chapter to a conclusion, that there is one other view (and a very common one among us, in more modern times) on this subject, which I have not yet noticed ; namely, that which maintains, that baptism, as the act of incorporation into the visible Church, may properly be described as conferring regeneration, as being an introduction into a new state, bringing new duties, responsibilities, privileges and blessings, and consequently that *all* may in this sense be said to be regenerated in baptism. It is held by those who maintain this view, that it may or may not be accompanied with the gift of *spiritual* regeneration, but that as the introduction into a new ecclesiastical state, it may properly be said to be a regenerating ordinance. Hence has arisen the distinction between baptismal and spiritual regeneration. And, no doubt, the

---

* Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam *ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt*. Sicut ergo secundum quemdam modum sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est. (Epist. ad Bonif. Ep. 98, Op. ed. Ben. tom. 2, col. 267.)

† Quia in Christo dicimus baptizatum, fatemur eum Christum induisse ; et si hoc fatemur, regeneratum fatemur..... Induunt autem homines Christum, aliquando usque ad sacramenti perceptionem, aliquando et usque ad vitæ sanctificationem : atque illud primum et bonis et malis potest esse commune, hoc autem alterum proprium est bonorum et piorum. (De Bapt. contr. Donat. lib. I. c. xi. ; lib. V. c. xxiv. ; Op. ed. Ben. tom. 9, fol. 88, and 157.)

word *regeneration* may be, in itself, fairly and correctly used in this sense; but it seems to me to be alienating it from its Scriptural sense to do so. This view may be connected with various theological systems, and according to the system adopted will be the explanation given as to the precise state of the baptized infant; but into that it is unnecessary here to enter.

Writers holding this view, therefore, understand the regeneration spoken of in the Baptismal Service as being always conferred, but as not necessarily implying more than what they would call baptismal regeneration.

I am unable, I confess, to view the language of the Service in this light. It appears to me that regeneration, in the full Scriptural sense of the word, as implying incorporation into the true Church and Body of Christ, is prayed for, and that the thanksgiving is for the presumed bestowal of the blessing asked.

I should be very sorry, however, to assert, that such a view cannot be honestly and legally maintained in our Church.

And of course the testimony of those who have held it as the doctrine of our Church, is a strong witness against the correctness, or, at least, Anglican character, of such extremely opposite views as those of the Bishop of Exeter. It has been held by a large number of our more modern divines; and consequently, while they have adopted the *affirmative* and not the *hypothetical* principle of interpretation in the Baptismal Service, they have nevertheless earnestly advocated the necessity of regeneration, in the full Scriptural sense of the spiritual new-birth, for those who, though baptized in infancy, have not exhibited the marks of spiritual regeneration.

It must be recollected, therefore, that there are two views advocated among our divines on this subject, (namely, that mentioned above as held by Dr. Jackson, and the one just referred to) in which, though the language of the Service is interpreted *affirmatively*, yet it is with a meaning entirely different from that affixed to it by the Bishop of Exeter; and one which leaves the question,—in what cases *spiritual* regeneration in the highest sense is conferred on infants in baptism,—quite open.

For any clear understanding of the testimony of our divines on this matter, it is quite essential that we bear in mind the existence of these different views among them. Otherwise we

may quote, as authorities for a particular doctrine, statements which were far from being intended to bear the meaning we attribute to them. Thus, for instance, the Bishop of Exeter has quoted from Dr. Jackson a passage nearly identical in *words* with his own statements, but which Dr. Jackson intended to be understood in a very different *sense*.

And my great object in offering these preliminary remarks is, to point out the different views that may be, and have been, entertained on the subject, within the limits our Church seems to prescribe; in order both to shew the reader the various aspects under which it may be viewed, and to prevent a misconception of the meaning of testimonies to be hereafter adduced.

The moderation of our Reformers induced them to leave points on which Scripture has not spoken explicitly, open, within Scriptural limits, to a difference of view. And accordingly there has been from the first some variety of sentiment among our divines on this subject. That there were any, however, who embraced such views as those advocated by the Bishop of Exeter and the modern "High Church" school, until about the times of Mountagu and Laud, in the latter part of the reign of James I., I have yet to learn. And for the way in which our Formularies were originally understood, (and consequently for the interpretation which has at least the *best* claim upon our acceptance), we must go to the testimonies we find in the works of our Reformers and early divines, particularly of those who were instrumental in establishing those Formularies upon their present basis. And here we shall find ourselves in a school of theology very different from that which has long held the supremacy among us. This fact it is essential to realize, if we would arrive at any correct conclusion as to their doctrine on the matter before us. And therefore I shall devote an early chapter to the elucidation of this point.

The views held on the subject of Baptism have always been intimately connected with, and corresponding to, those held on the subject of the nature of the Church.

Now on the latter point, there have been two leading views into which the opinions of our divines have been divided. One of which is this,—That the nominal Church consists of two distinct portions, one consisting of those who will ultimately be

saved, the other of all those who will ultimately perish; of which the former correspond to the wheat, and the latter to the chaff, in the Scripture parable. And, following out the view of the subject which this parable and other similar descriptions of the Church in Scripture seem to give, the maintainers of this doctrine hold, that those sown as wheat by our Lord never become chaff; that those who are once truly united to his mystical body, the true Church, never perish.

In connexion with this view, it is held, that the full baptismal blessing can be enjoyed by those only who are adopted by Christ as wheat—as true members of his mystical body.

The other view is this;—

That there is no *such* distinction between the members of the nominal Church, but that all who are baptized are alike regarded by Christ as members of his body, and equally partakers of the influences of his Spirit.

In connexion with this view, baptism is regarded as, in all cases, equally, the formal act of incorporation into the true body of Christ, bringing the baptized into the possession of all the spiritual influences vouchsafed by Christ even to those who will ultimately be saved. It is held that as baptism is the ordinance by which the party baptized promises faith and obedience, so in it God bestows the gifts of the Holy Spirit, unites to Christ's Church, and promises final salvation on the fulfilment of certain conditions, *in the case of every infant*, without any reference to any purpose of his own will, or any previous work of his on the heart, or any future faith and repentance in the child.

Of these two views the works of our Reformers clearly show that they maintained the former, and therefore, whatever minor variations are traceable in their doctrine on the subject of Baptism, the modern "High Church" notion of all the baptized receiving indiscriminately the full baptismal blessing was opposed by them all.

It seems to be forgotten by those who would limit our Formularies to such a sense, that our early divines made common cause with the Continental Reformers, particularly (and indeed, in Queen Elizabeth's time, exclusively) with those of the "Reformed" (that is, more or less, Calvinistic) Churches. And the leading divines of those Churches were the great authorities, of later times, quoted by them in their works.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE VIEWS OF SOME OF THE EARLIER SCHOLASTIC DIVINES.

Before I proceed to those testimonies which are of authority in our Church in determining the question under discussion, it may be worth while to point out to the reader the fact, that the doctrine of some of our "High Church" divines of the present day is much less consistent with a sound Protestant view of the subject than even that of some of the earlier scholastic divines. Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences, the Father of the Scholastic divines, might be read by them with advantage on this point.

In referring however to those authors, I must carefully guard myself against the supposition, that I attribute to them any weight in determining the doctrine of our Protestant Church. And the reference which is now being made to them by the Tractarian party, in support of their errors, I regard as a delusion,—nay more, as an unwarrantable attempt to mislead the public mind, by sending it to sources of information of a corrupt character, and opposed to the doctrines of our Church. A writer of this school has recently ventured to maintain that "the language of our Forms can only be understood by reference —not to the Reformers, but—to the theology of the Schools." And passages are given by writers of this Party, from the Scholastic divines, as if they had a species of authority among us. Perhaps a Roman Catholic author will be a better authority with such writers than a Protestant, to show them their mistake. I will therefore give them an extract from Sanders's work "De Schismate Anglicano."

In his account of the Reformation under Edward VI., under the head "The Scholastic Doctrine exploded," ("Doctrina scholastica explosa,") he says,—

"All the books of those masters who have taught theology and the other sciences with power and judgment, they hurl out of the hands of students, and almost from the Libraries, inasmuch as they know that by their sound doctrine and methodical treatment of the subject, the popular frauds of the heretics are without difficulty perceived and dispelled; Lombard, Aquinas, Scotus, and the other most learned Scholastics, they accuse of barbarism, ignorance of the Scriptures, and various errors, and inveigh as much as they can against their memory."*

This extract may suffice to show how much weight was allowed to the Scholastic divines by our Reformers.†

And so early as 1536, Archbishop Cranmer used the following language respecting them publicly in Convocation:—

"To determine anything, especially in a Synod, without warrant from the Scriptures, was not becoming the character of a Bishop. *That the nicety and jargon of the School divines was more proper for boys in the University than divines in such a solemn assembly.*"‡

But it may not be without its use to refer to Peter Lombard on this occasion, because we certainly may derive from his statements on the point now in question an *a fortiori* argument as to the doctrine of our Church.

The Master of the Sentences, no doubt, holds, that all the infants of Christians receive in baptism remission of their sins. But on the question, "Whether grace is given to infants in baptism by which they may profit in riper years," he says,—

"It is often also asked, whether grace is given to infants in bap-

---

* Libros omnes eorum magistrorum qui vi et ratione Theologiam cæterasque disciplinas tradiderunt, quia istorum solida doctrina et methodica institutione hæreticorum populares fraudes non difficulter cerni et dispelli sciebant, *e studiosorum manibus et fere e bibliothecis exutiunt*; Lombardi, Aquinatis, Scoti, cæterorumque doctissimorum scholasticorum nomina de *barbarie, Scripturarum ignoratione, et varia deceptione traducunt, memoriamque quantum possunt damnant*, &c. (Ed. Col. Agripp. 1610, p. 233.)

† In the above remarks, I am not, of course, denying, that some illustrations of the meaning of phrases used by our Reformers may be gathered from the works of the Scholastic divines, but only that our Reformers attributed any weight to their writings as exponents of the Christian faith.

‡ Collier's Eccl. Hist. ii. 121.

tism, by which, when they have the opportunity of using their free will, they may have a good inclination of the will and run well. For with respect to adults who receive the Sacrament worthily, it is not doubted, but that they have received influencing and co-operating grace . . . . But respecting infants who have not arrived at the use of their reason, there is a question, whether in baptism they have received grace by which, when they come to riper years, they may be able to will and work what is good. *It appears that they have not received it;* inasmuch as that grace is love and faith which prepares and aids the will. And who will say that they have received faith and love? But if they have not received grace by which they may be able to do good works when they have grown up, *therefore the grace given in baptism is not sufficient for them in this state* [*i. e.* as adults], *nor can they now be good through it, but need the addition of other grace.*"

Such was the view taken even by the Father of the Scholastic divines. Without entering into the question whether he may not have overstated the matter in denying that such grace is ever given, one thing is quite clear, namely, his opposition to such views as those of the Bishop of Exeter. In fairness to his Lordship, however, I will add, that he admits that,—

"*Some* think that influencing and co-operating grace is given to all infants in baptism, so far as concerns the *bestowal*, not the *use* of it, so that, when they have grown up, they may obtain the use from the gift, unless through their free will they extinguish the use of the gift by sinning.*"

---

* *Si parvulis datur in baptismo gratia quâ possunt in majori ætate proficere.* Solet etiam quæri, si parvulis in baptismo datur gratia quâ cum tempus habuerint utendi libero arbitrio possint bene velle et currere? De adultis enim qui digne recipiunt sacramentum non ambigitur, quin gratiam operantem et co-operantem perceperint; quæ in vacuum eis cedit si per liberum arbitrium post mortaliter deliquerint; qui merito peccati gratiam appositam perdunt. Unde dicuntur contumeliam Spiritui Sancto facere et ipsum a se fugare. De parvulis vero qui nondum ratione utuntur quæstio est, an in baptismo recipiunt gratiam qua ad majorem venientes ætatem possint velle et operari bonum? Videtur quod non receperint; quia gratia illa charitas est et fides quæ voluntatem præparat et adjuvat. Sed quis dixerit eos accepisse fidem et charitatem? Si vero gratiam non receperint qua bene operari possunt cum fuerint adulti, non ergo sufficit eis in hoc statu gratia in baptismo data; nec per illam possunt modò boni esse, nisi alia addatur; quæ si non additur, non est ex eorum culpa quia justificati sunt a peccato. Quidam putant gratiam operantem et co-operantem cunctis parvulis in baptismo dari in munere non in usu, ut cum ad majorem venerint ætatem ex munere sortiantur usum nisi per liberum arbitrium usum muneris extinguant peccando: et ita ex culpa eorum est non ex defectu gratiæ quod mali fiunt; quia ex Dei munere valentes habere usum bonum, per liberum arbitrium renuerunt, et usum pravum elegerunt. (Petr. Lombard. Sentent. lib. 4, dist. 4, fol. 82. Ed. Paris, 1510. 12mo.)

Nor had Peter Lombard any notion of that inseparable and exclusive connexion between the sign and the thing signified which our modern "High Churchmen" so strenuously contend for. For he says:—

"If it is asked of what thing that baptism is a Sacrament, which is given to one *already justified*, we reply, that it is both a Sacrament of that thing which has *preceded* it, that is, of *the remission bestowed before through faith*, and of the remission of temporal punishment, or of the sin, if any, that is committed in the meantime, and of the renewal and all the grace there granted. For it is a sign of every thing of which it is a cause. Nor must you be surprised, *that the thing sometimes precedes the Sacrament*, since sometimes also it follows *long after*, as in the case of those who come hypocritically, to whom, *when afterwards they shall have repented, baptism will begin to be of use;* in whom baptism was the Sacrament of this sanctification which they have on repentance. But if they should never repent, nor depart from their hypocrisy, of what thing would the baptism received by them be a Sacrament? It may be replied,—of that thing which *would be there if their wickedness did not prevent it*."*

And very similarly, in one place, speaks even Thomas Aquinas.

"Adults," he says, "believing before on Christ, are *incorporated into him mentally*, but afterwards when they are baptised, are incorporated into him in a manner corporally, to wit through the visible Sacrament, without the intention to partake of which they would not have been even mentally incorporated."†

The following passages also are well worth notice, in further illustration of Peter Lombard's views on this subject:—

---

* Si quæritur cujus rei baptismus ille sit Sacramentum qui datur jam justo; dicimus Sacramentum esse et rei quæ præcessit, id est, remissionis ante per fidem datæ, et remissionis temporalis pœnæ sive peccati si habetur quod interim committitur, et novitatis ac omnis gratiæ ibi præstitæ. Omnis etenim rei signum est, cujus causa est. Nec mireris rem aliquando præcedere Sacramentum, cum aliquando etiam longe post sequatur; ut in illis qui ficte accedunt, quibus cum postea pœnituerint incipiet baptismus prodesse; in quibus fuit baptismus Sacramentum hujus sanctificationis quam pœnitendo habent. Sed si nunquam pœniterent, nec a figmento recederent, cujus rei Sacramentum esset baptismus ab illis susceptus? Potest dici rei quæ ibi fieret si non eorum enormitas impediret. (Petr. Lombard. Sentent. lib. 4. dist. 4. G. fol. 82.)

† Adulti prius credentes in Christum sunt ei incorporati mentaliter; sed postmodum cum baptizantur, incorporantur ei quodammodo corporaliter, scilicet per visibile Sacramentum, sine cujus proposito nec mentaliter incorporari potuissent. (Aquin. Summ. Theolog. part 3. q. 69. Art. 5. p. 177. ed. Paris. 1631. fol.)

"*De ficte accedentibus.* Qui vero sine fide vel ficte accedunt, Sacramentum non rem suscipiunt. Unde Hieronymus (super Ezech. xvi.), Sunt lavacra gentilium hæreticorum, sed non lavant ad salutem. In Ecclesia etiam, qui non plena fide accipiunt baptisma, non Spiritum sed aquam suscipiunt. Augustinus etiam ait (super Ps. 83.), Judæis omnibus communia erant Sacramenta, sed non communis omnibus erat gratia quæ est virtus Sacramentorum ; ita et nunc communis est baptismus omnibus baptizatis, sed non virtus baptismi, id est, ipsa gratia. Item, (De pœnit.) omnis qui jam suæ voluntatis arbiter constitutus est, cum accedit ad Sacramentum fidelium, nisi pœniteat eum veteris vitæ, novam non potest inchoare. Ab hac pœnitentia cum baptizantur soli parvuli immunes sunt. His aliisque testimoniis apte ostenditur adultis sine fide et pœnitentia vera in baptismo non conferri gratiam remissionis ; quia nec parvulis sine fide aliena, qui propriam habere nequeunt, datur in baptismo remissio. Si quis ergo ficte accedit, non habens veram cordis contritionem, Sacramentum *sine re* accipit." (Petr. Lombard. Sentent. lib. 4. dist. 4 B. fol. 79.)

"*Quomodo intelligatur illud, Quotquot in Christo baptizati estis Christum induistis.* Quæritur ergo quomodo illud accipiatur, Quotquot in Christo, baptizati estis, Christum induistis ? Potest dici quod qui in Christo, id est, in Christi conformitate baptizantur, scilicet, ut moriantur vetustati peccati, sicut Christus vetustati pœnæ, induunt Christum quem per gratiam inhabitantem habent. Potest et aliter solvi. Duobus enim modis Christum induere dicimur, vel assumptione sacramenti, vel rei perceptione. Unde Augustinus (De bapt. contra Don.), Induunt homines Christum aliquando usque ad sacramenti perceptionem, aliquando usque ad vitæ sanctificationem : atque illud primum bonis et malis potest esse commune, hoc autem est proprium bonorum et piorum. Omnes ergo qui in Christi nomine baptizantur, Christum induunt vel secundum sacramenti perceptionem, vel secundum vitæ sanctificationem. (Petr. Lombard. Sentent. lib. 4. dist. 4. C. fol. 79, 80.)

"Quod vero invisibilis sanctificatio sine visibili sacramento quibusdam insit, aperte Augustinus tradit super Levit. (q. 88), dicens invisibilem sanctificationem quibusdam affuisse et profuisse sine visibilibus sacramentis ; visibilem vero sanctificationem quæ fit sacramento visibili sine invisibili posse adesse ; non posse prodesse. Nec tamen visibile sacramentum ideo contemnendum est, quia contemptor ejus invisibiliter sanctificari non potest. Hinc Cornelius et qui cum eo erant, jam Spiritu sanctificati baptizati sunt. . . Solet etiam quæri de illis qui jam sanctificati Spiritu cum fide et charitate ad baptismum accedunt quis [quid] ei [eis] conferat baptismus. Nihil enim eis

videtur præstare, cum per fidem et contritionem *jam remissis peccatis justificati sunt.* Ad quod sane dici potest, eos quidem per fidem et contritionem justificatos, id est a macula peccati purgatos, et a debito eternæ pœnæ absolutos, tamen adhuc teneri satisfactione temporali qua pœnitentes ligantur in ecclesia. Cum autem baptismum percipiunt, et a peccatis, si quæ interim post conversionem contraxerunt, mundantur, et ab exteriori sanctificatione [satisfactione] absolvuntur, et *adjutrix gratia omnisque virtus in eo augetur,* ut vere novus homo tunc dici possit. Fomes quoque peccati in eo magis debilitatur. . . . Multum ergo confert baptismus etiam *jam per fidem justificato,* quia accedens ad baptismum quasi ramus a columba portatur in arcam. *Ante intus erat judicio Dei,* sed nunc etiam judicio Ecclesiæ intus est." (Ib. ib. lib. 4. dist. 4: E. F. fol. 81, 82.)

These passages appear to me well worth the attention of some among us. It will be recollected that they were written by Peter Lombard, about the middle of the 12th century.

And the doctrine that sanctifying grace was always conferred upon infants in baptism, did not become a ruled doctrine in the Church of Rome till the Council of Vienne in 1311, and was then only laid down as the *more probable* opinion.

For in a letter of Pope Innocent IV. in 1250, afterwards inserted in the Canon Law, it is distinctly recognized as an *open* question, whether grace is or is not conferred upon infants in baptism, in the following words,

"Illud vero quod opponentes inducunt, fidem aut charitatem, aliasque virtutes parvulis, *utpote non consentientibus,* non infundi, *a plerisque non conceditur absolute,* cum propter hoc inter doctores theologos quæstio referatur, aliis asserentibus, per virtutem baptismi parvulis quidem culpam remitti, sed *gratiam non conferri;* nonnullis dicentibus, dimitti peccatum et virtutes infundi habentibus illas, quoad habitum, non quoad usum, donec perveniant [*al.* pervenerint] ad ætatem adultam."*

And the words in which Pope Clement V. determined the point in the Council of Vienne in 1311 (also inserted in the Canon Law), are these,—

"Verum quia, quantum ad effectum baptismi in parvulis, reperiuntur doctores quidam theologi opiniones contrarias habuisse: quibusdam ex ipsis dicentibus, per virtutem baptismi parvulis quidem

* Decret. Gregor. lib. 3, tit. 42, Corp. Jur. Can. Col. Munat. 1783, vol. ii., col. 521.

culpam remitti, sed gratiam non conferri : aliis e contra asserentibus quod et culpa eisdem in baptismo remittitur, et virtutes ac informans gratia infunduntur, quoad habitum, etsi non pro illo tempore quoad usum : nos autem attendentes generalem efficaciam mortis Christi, (quæ per baptisma applicatur pariter omnibus baptizatis) opinionem secundam (quæ dicit, tam parvulis quam adultis conferri in baptismo informantem gratiam et virtutes) *tanquam* PROBABILIOREM, *et dictis Sanctorum ac Doctorum modernorum Theologiæ magis consonam ac concordem*, sacro approbante Concilio, duximus eligendam."*

These passages, then, clearly show the difference of opinion that prevailed, and was freely allowed to prevail, even in the middle ages, on the question whether anything more was bestowed upon infants in baptism than the remission of original sin. That they might call this regeneration, I freely admit ; but the most objectionable part of the doctrine of our modern "High Church" divines is, that the regeneration which (in their view) takes place in all infants at baptism, includes those gifts of grace that give spiritual life to the soul. Now we see from the above extracts, that so little was this doctrine recognised by a large proportion even of the Middle Age divines (inclined surely to take a sufficiently high view of the power of the Priesthood and the virtue of the Sacraments), that they denied that those gifts were conferred at all upon infants.

And it was not till some time after the age of the Master of the Sentences that the notion arose of sacramental grace being always conferred, from the mere performance of the act (*ex opere operato*), upon all who did not put the impediment of mortal sin (*ponentes obicem mortalis peccati*) in the way of the effects of the Sacraments. And so monstrous and unscriptural is this view of the *ex opere operato* salutary effect of the Sacraments, that many of the Romanists themselves have endeavoured to explain away the words, so as to give them a sense very different from what they were ordinarily understood to imply. As for instance, the divines of Cologne, in their "Antididagma" against the "Deliberatio" of Archbishop Herman, who endeavour to explain the words as referring only to the validity of the sacramental act on the part of the priest *as God's minister*,

* Corp. Jur. Can. ; Clement. lib. 1. tit. 1. Ed. ead. Vol. ii. col. 194.

in contradistinction to the *opus operantis,* or work of the priest personally.*

But the phrase, as ordinarily used among the later Scholastic divines and Romanists, is evidently intended to mean more than this. And, explain the words as they will, the remark of the Article of 1552 on them is most just; that as the phrase "is strange and unknown to Holy Scripture, so it *engendereth no godly, but a very superstitious, sense.*" (Art. 26 of 1552.) And so are the following remarks of Bucer, in his reply to the "Antididagma."

"De opere operato. Cap. 101.

"Hoc loco dicunt adversarii, scholasticis doctoribus inciviliter et malitiose affingi, quasi docuerint opus sacerdotis in missâ valere coram Deo ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis, sineque opere operantis, hoc est, etiamsi nec sacerdos nec populus suum opus, hoc est veram fidem adjungat.

"Responsio.

"Hanc erroneam seductoriamque doctrinam Christiani nemini adscribunt, nisi qui ultro se illi adjungit. Quoniam vero experientia compertum est, multa millia sacerdotum quotidie contra ordinationem et institutionem Domini missas facere, aliosque homines eas audire, quos ambos propria vita convincit, quod omni pœnitentia ac fide vacui sint, quandoquidem in manifestis et excommunicatione dignis flagitiis sceleribusque contra conscientiam hærent, negari non potest errorem istum in nimis magna hominum parte sat altas radices egisse, quas necdum adversarii evellere tentant, quin potius omnibus iis, quæ ad conservationem istius abominationis faciunt, fuco patrocinantur.

"Alioqui verum est, S. Cœnam juxta institutionem Christi administratam, per se bonum ac salutiferum opus esse omnibus qui ea rite utuntur: etiam si sacerdos omni fide destitutus sit, modo populus sine propria culpa id ignoret. Consimilis ratio est etiam de cæteris ministeriis ecclesiasticis, mandatis ab ipso Domino, in quibus omnibus solum opus operatum, hoc est opus juxta verbum et mandatum Domini peractum, atque idcircò opus ipsius Domini, quamvis per ministrum externè absolutum, utile ac salutiferum est fidelibus: siquidem illud tanquam opus Domini vera fide recipiant et usurpent: nihilque obest illis opus operantis ministri, licet impurum sit, hoc est, non quidem vera fide, sed tamen alioquin juxta institutionem

* Antididagma, seu Christianæ et Catholicæ Relig. per Canon. Metrop. Eccles. Colon. propugnatio. fol. 71. Ed. Colon. 1544. fol.

Jesu Christi a ministro perfectum. Omnis enim gratia in sacramentis nullo modo ex opere operantis ministri, sed ex opere operato Christi, quod ibi juxta verbum et mandatum illius præbetur, proficiscitur. Nihilominus tamen opus operantis sumentis et sacris Christi utentis quoque accedere oportet, hoc est, indubitatam fidem in Christum et promissiones ejus, quæ opus Christi apprehendit, eoque fruitur. Non quod fides aliquid ex se nobis promereatur, vel ad opus meritumque Christi nonnihil ponderis præterea adferat, sed quod opus meritumque Christi apprehendat.

"Quod si voluerimus ad hunc modum ista verba intelligere, nihil controversiæ in se habent. Verum loquendum est juxta vulgarem consuetudinem, et ad captum hominum, quò veritas omnibus perspicuè patefieri, et a mendacio propriè discerni queat: quò et mendacium homines relinquere, et veritati firmiter adhærere possint. Neque licet in Ecclesia Christi ejusmodi horrendis abominationibus fucatis sermonibus patrocinari, quo facilius rudioribus hominibus tanquam insignes cultus supponantur, vel ipsi in talibus abominationibus confirmentur. Jam vero nimis, proh dolor, manifestum est, quomodo homines apud missam opere operato non Christi Domini, sed sacerdotis fidant: idque non eo modo quo instituit Dominus, et ipsius opus esset: sed quemadmodum jamdudum contra ordinationem Domini depravatum, opusque Antichristi factum est. Adhæc quomodo nihil curent opus operantis, vel ministri, utrum fideliter id peragat, vel sumentis, qui tamen judicium sibi sumit, quando sine proprio opere operantis, hoc est, opere veræ fidei suæ, opus operatum, quamvis juxta mandatum et institutionem Domini peractum, usurpat, vel ejus se participem reddit." (Buceri Constans Defensio, &c. Genev. 1613. 4to, pp. 317, 318.)

I shall not, however, detain the reader longer upon the subject of this chapter, except to remark, that there is one other point on which the views of many of the Romanists and Scholastic divines were sounder than those which have lately been received among us. It was with great regret that I found Mr. Maskell advocating the notion of the elements in the Sacraments *conveying* the grace given. The remark occurs in connection with the following complaint respecting Hooker. "Of the grace [i. e. of the Sacraments], only need we inquire further into what this great divine understood by it: and I may pass on to that the more readily, as his remarks seem *scarcely enough to reach to the full extent of Catholic teaching, with regard to the 'element' and 'the word.'*" And in what does the reader suppose that

it falls short of "*Catholic* teaching?" Mr. Maskell shall state it in his own words. "For, in the eucharist, for example, 'the word' has more effect than simply to express what is done by the element, inasmuch as it *endues the element with its mysterious power;* making, in conjunction with the other essential rites, the bread to be the Body and the wine to be the Blood of our Blessed Lord. So in Baptism: 'the element' not alone sheweth and signifieth, but CONVEYETH GRACE." (On Baptism, pp. 23, 24.)

Here is an error against which, beyond doubt, our Reformers with one voice, and in the strongest terms, protested; an error moreover which many of the most celebrated divines of Rome itself,—almost all the Scholastic divines,—repudiated. I say this on the authority of one of Rome's most able divines, Estius; who observes,—

"Alii vero neque proprie dictam, id est, physicam instrumenti rationem in sacramentis agnoscunt, neque virtutem aliquam creatam eis inesse putant, qua gratiæ effectum operentur; sed dicunt *hactenus tantum* sacramenta esse efficacia gratiæ signa, quia *divina virtus sacramentis* ad producendum gratiæ effectum certo et infallibiliter ex Christi promissione *assistit*, ut videlicet habeant rationem causæ sine qua non, vel potius causæ instrumentalis generaliter dictæ,—instrumentum morale vocant. Hanc opinionem tradunt Scotus, Henricus a Gandavo, Bonaventura, Durandus, Alexander de Ales, et *alii plerique*."

And he adds that this opinion "fuisse et esse inter scholasticos doctores communem sententiam, quemadmodum testatur Bonaventura ad Distinctionem ult. libri 3. Sentent., et confitetur Dominicus Sotus in præsentem Distinctionem, dicens eam esse omnium fere doctorum etiam neotericorum, quæst. 3. art. 1 et 4." And he remarks, that the Council of Trent has worded its statements so as to avoid a determination of this question.*

I have purposely abstained, in this work, from discussing the question of the doctrine of the Fathers on the subject; not from any unwillingness to enter upon the inquiry, but on the ground that the doctrine of our Reformers and early divines, to whom we are indebted for our Formularies of faith and worship, must

* Estius, Comment. in Libr. Sentent. Lib. 4, dist. 1. §. 5. pp. 6, 7. Ed. Neap. 1720. Vol. 2.

be judged of by their own writings. I will, however, just point the attention of the reader to one passage from a Father often quoted on the subject, (Augustine), as showing that while he uses the word "regeneration" to describe the effects of baptism in all infants, he does not suppose a spiritual regeneration to take place which gives a principle of spiritual life to change the bias of the heart.

"Sicut ergo in Abraham præcessit fidei justitia, et accessit circumcisio signaculum justitiæ fidei: ita in Cornelio præcessit sanctificatio spiritalis in dono Spiritus Sancti, et accessit sacramentum regenerationis in lavacro baptismi. Et sicut in Isaac, qui octavo suæ nativitatis die circumcisus est, præcessit signaculum justitiæ fidei, et, *quoniam patris fidem imitatus est, secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia*, cujus *signaculum* in infante præcesserat: ita in baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacramentum; et *si* Christianam tenuerint pietatem, *sequetur etiam in corde conversio* cujus *mysterium* præcessit in corpore. Et sicut in illo latrone quod ex baptismi sacramento defuerat complevit Omnipotentis benignitas, quia non superbia vel contemtu sed necessitate defuerat: sic in infantibus qui baptizati moriuntur, eadem gratia Omnipotentis implere credenda est, quod non ex impia voluntate, sed ex ætatis indigentia, nec corde credere ad justitiam possunt, nec ore confiteri ad salutem. Ideo cùm alii pro eis respondent, ut impleatur erga eos celebratio sacramenti, valet utique ad eorum *consecrationem*, quia ipsi respondere non possunt. . . . . Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur, aliud esse sacramentum baptismi, aliud conversionem cordis, sed salutem hominis ex utroque compleri." (Aug. De Bapt. contra Donat. lib. 5. cc. 24, 25. IX. 140, 141, ed. Bened.)

CHAPTER III.

ON THE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY TO WHICH OUR REFORMERS AND EARLY DIVINES BELONGED.

The difference of meaning attached to the same theological terms and expressions, by men of different schools of theology, renders it of great importance, in an inquiry like the present, to know the prevailing tone of theology among those whose views on any particular point we are endeavouring to ascertain. It may be useful, therefore, if, before I proceed further, I endeavour to throw some light upon the question, What was the prevailing bias of the theology of our Reformers and early divines, especially respecting the Church, Predestination, and some kindred topics; the views entertained on those points having manifestly an important influence upon the subject of the effects of infant baptism. This is the more necessary, from the circumstance of attempts having frequently been made, since the prevailing tone of doctrine in our Church became changed, and the writings of our early divines (with very few exceptions) disregarded and often almost unknown, of representing their general views of doctrine as very different from what they were in reality. From the paucity of the remains of our early theological literature of the Reformed school, this was no difficult task. But times are now changed in this respect. The conflict which *the true successors of the Reformers* have had to maintain, even for toleration in our Church, has led to an extensive republication of the works of our Reformation divines. And we have already some indications that more just views on the subject are beginning to prevail even among those who are attached to that Laudean school of theology that succeeded the school of our Reformers, as we

may judge from the extract given in my recent reply to the Bishop of Exeter's Charge.*

I would premise, however, that while I adduce the following testimonies as showing the *prevailing* bias of the theology of our Church at the time spoken of, I by no means wish to imply that the Articles and Formularies of our Church were formed upon a Procrustean principle of reducing the views of all to the *precise* standard of that prevailing bias. Our Reformers were men of far too much Christian charity to adopt such a principle. But the object which I have in view is simply this, to prove, by showing the general tone and character of the theology of our early divines of the Reformed school, what modern school among us approaches the nearest to their standard, and consequently *to the intended meaning of the Formularies they drew up.* My conviction is, that I might take *much higher ground* than this, but with this I am contented. And though the discussion has only a general bearing upon the subject more immediately before us, yet its indirect evidence respecting it will be admitted, by all those who know how much any one's doctrine upon the point in question may be judged by the system of theology to which he is attached, to be of very great force. In fact, if it shall appear (and I believe it to be undeniable), that their doctrine was, in the most important points, what is now called "Calvinistic," there is, or ought to be, an *end* to the controversy as to the interpretation they intended to be given to our Formularies, both as it respects baptism and several other points.

When we speak of the theology of our Reformers, we can hardly consider anything previous to the time of Edward VI., (until which period the Reformation can scarcely be said to have been established) as entitled to much weight in elucidating its character. But I will go back a little way into the reign of Henry VIII. in order to show what was even then the doctrine of our leading Reformers on the subject of the present chapter.

And I begin with the "Institution of a Christian Man," published in 1537, with the sanction of the great body of the Bishops and Clergy; in the drawing up of which Archbishop Cranmer

* See "Vindication of the Defence of the XXXIX Articles," pp. 4, 5. Also a remarkable article that appeared in 1842 in the British Critic, No. lxiv. pp. 300 et seq., from which I shall presently give some extracts.

had the principal hand. Amidst much that is objectionable and thoroughly Popish, and that was in a few years entirely discarded by the Archbishop, (so that no inference in favour of any Popish doctrine contained therein being subsequently maintained by him, can be legitimately drawn from it) there is also much of a decidedly Protestant character, standing out in very remarkable contrast with the nominal Protestantism of modern "High Churchmen." I allude more particularly to that remarkable portion of it called the Interpretation of the Creed, in which the views that ought to be entertained by a Christian man on each Article are expressed by a large paraphrase. I would call the attention of the reader to the following extracts.* I take the passages as they come, begging the reader to observe particularly the views of Cranmer and his party, even at that time, on the nature of the true Church of Christ as distinguished from the nominal Church, and on the appropriating character of true faith.

From the paraphrase of the first Article.

"I believe also and profess, that he is my very God, my Lord, and my Father, and that I am his servant and his own son, by adoption and grace, and the right inheritor of his kingdom." (p. 31.)

From the paraphrase of the second Article.

"I believe also and profess, that Jesu Christ is not only Jesus, and Lord to all men that believe in him, but also that he is my Jesus, my God and my Lord. For whereas of my nature I was born in sin, &c. . . . . I believe, I say, that I being in this case, Jesu Christ, by suffering of most painful and shameful death upon the cross, &c. . . . . hath now pacified his Father's indignation *towards me*, and hath reconciled *me* again into his favour, and that he hath loosed and delivered *me* from the yoke and tyranny of death, of the devil, and of sin, and hath made *me* so free from them, that they shall not finally hurt or annoy *me;* and that he hath poured out plentifully his Holy Spirit and his graces upon *me*, specially *faith*, to illumine and direct my reason and judgment, and *charity* to direct my will and affections towards God, whereby I am so perfectly restored to the light and knowledge of God, to the spiritual

* They are taken from the edition in "Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the reign of Henry VIII. Oxf. 1825," 8vo. This book was published by the late Dr. Lloyd, Bishop of Oxford.

fear and dread of God, and unto the love of him and mine neighbour, that with his grace I am now ready to obey, and able to fulfil and accomplish his will and commandments. Besides all this, he hath brought and delivered me from darkness and blindness to light, from death to life, and from sin to justice, and he hath taken me into his protection, and made me as his own peculiar possession, and he hath *planted and grafted me into his own body, and made me a member of the same,* and he hath communicated and made me participant of his justice, his power, his life, his felicity, and of all his goods; so that now I may boldly say and believe, as indeed I do perfectly believe, that by his passion, his death, his blood, and his conquering of death, of sin, and of the devil, by his resurrection and ascension, he hath made a sufficient expiation or propitiation towards God, that is to say, a sufficient satisfaction and recompense as well for my original sin, as also for all the actual sins that ever I have committed, and that I am so clearly rid from all the guilt of my said offences, and from the everlasting pain due for the same, that neither sin, nor death, nor hell, shall be able, or have any power, to hurt me or to let me, but that after this transitory life I shall ascend into heaven, there to reign with my Saviour Christ perpetually in glory and felicity." (pp. 34, 35.)

From the paraphrase on the fourth Article.

"I believe that by this passion and death of our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only my corporal death is so destroyed that it shall never have power to hurt me, but rather it is made wholesome and profitable unto me, but also that all my sins, and the sins also of all them that do believe in him and follow him, be mortified and dead, that is to say, all the guilt and offence thereof, and also the damnation and pain due for the same, is clearly extincted, abolished, and washed away, so that the same shall not afterward be imputed or inflicted unto me. And therefore will I have this passion and this death in my daily remembrance. And I will not only glory and rejoice continually therein, and give all the thanks I can unto God for the same, considering I *have and shall assuredly attain thereby my redemption, my justification, my reconciliation unto God's favour, and life everlasting;* but I will also endeavour myself, to my possible power, and by the help of God, to follow this my Saviour Jesu Christ," &c. (p. 40.)

From the paraphrase on the fifth Article.

"I believe. . . . that the devil, with all his power, craft, subtlety, and malice, is now subdued and made captive, not only unto *me*,

but also unto all *the other faithful people and right believers* in Jesu Christ that ever was [were] or shall be sith the time of Christ's said descending into hell. And that our Saviour Jesu Christ hath also, by this his passion and this his descending into hell, paid my ransom, and hath merited and deserved that neither my soul, neither the souls of any *such as be right believers in Christ*, shall come therein, or shall finally be encumbered with any title or accusation that the devil can object against us, or lay unto our charge."—"And I believe assuredly that by this descending of Christ into hell, and this his resurrection again from death to life, Christ hath merited and deserved for me and all true and faithful Christian men, not only that our souls shall never come into hell, but also that we shall here in this life be perfectly justified in the sight and acceptation of God, and shall have such grace, might, and power given unto us by him, that we shall be made able thereby to subdue, to mortify, and to extinguish our old Adam, and all our carnal and fleshly concupiscences, in such sort, that sin shall never afterward reign in our mortal bodies, but that we shall be wholly delivered from the kingdom of sin, and from spiritual death, and shall be resuscitated and *regenerated* into the new life of the Spirit and grace."—"Also that we shall after our corporal death, be preserved from the captivity of hell, and shall be made partakers of Christ's resurrection, that is to say, that we shall arise and live again in the self-same bodies and souls that we now have, and so shall utterly overcome death, in like manner as our Head and our Saviour Jesu Christ hath done before us, and shall finally live with him immortally in joy and felicity." (pp. 41—43.)

From the paraphrase of the eighth Article.

"I believe that . . . . neither it is possible for any man to come unto the Father by Christ, that is to say, to be reconciled into the favour of God, and to be *made and adopted into the number of his children*, or to obtain *any part of that incomparable treasure* which our Saviour Jesu Christ, by his nativity, his passion, his death, his resurrection, and his ascension, hath merited for mankind, unless this Holy Spirit shall *first illumine and inspire into his heart the right knowledge and faith of Christ, with due contrition and penance* for his sins*, and shall also afterward instruct him, govern him, aid him, direct him, and endue him with such special gifts and graces, as shall be requisite and necessary to that end and purpose."——"All

* The word is used in this document in the sense of penitential sorrow.

and singular which gifts and graces [*i. e.* "holy fear and dread of God," "fervent love and charity towards God and our neighbour," "spiritual wisdom and understanding," &c.] I acknowledge and profess that they proceed from this Holy Spirit, and that they be given, conferred, and distributed unto us mortal men here in earth, *at his own godly will, arbitre, and dispensation,* and that no man can purchase or obtain, ne yet *receive, retain, or use any one of them, without the special operation of this Holy Spirit.* And although he giveth not nor dispenseth the same equally and unto every man in like, yet he giveth always some portion thereof unto *all persons, which be accepted in the sight of God,* and that not only freely, and without all their deservings, but also in such plenty and measure, as unto his godly knowledge is thought to be most beneficial and expedient."——"And I believe . . . . that from that day [*i. e.* the day of Pentecost] unto the world's end, he hath been and shall be continually present, and also chief president in the Catholic Church of Christ, that is to say, that he hath and shall continually dwell in the hearts of all those people which shall be *the very members* of the same church, and shall teach and reveal unto them the secrets and mysteries of all truth, which is necessary for them to know, and that he shall also continually, from time to time, rule them, direct them, govern them, sanctify them, and give unto them *remission of their sins,* and all spiritual comfort, as well inwardly by faith, and other his secret operations, as also *outwardly by the open ministration and efficacy* of the word of God and of *his holy Sacraments;* and that he shall endue them with all such spiritual graces and gifts as shall be necessary for them to have, and so finally shall reward them with the gift of everlasting life and joy in heaven." (pp. 49—51.)

From the paraphrase of the ninth Article on the Church.

"I believe assuredly in my heart, and with my mouth I do profess and acknowledge, that there is and hath been ever from the beginning of the world, and so shall endure and continue for ever, one certain number, society, communion, or company of *the elect and faithful people of God;* of which number our Saviour Jesu Christ is the only head and governor, and the members of the same be all those holy saints which be now in heaven, and also all *the faithful people of God* which be now in life, or that ever heretofore have lived, or shall live here in this world, from the beginning unto the end of the same, and be ordained for their true faith and obedience unto the will of God [that true faith and consequent obedience being, according to the paraphrase on the preceding article, bestowed freely by the Holy Spirit according to his will], to be saved and to enjoy everlast-

ing life in heaven. And I believe assuredly that *this congregation*, according as it is called in Scripture, so it is in very deed the city of heavenly Jerusalem . . . . *the Holy Catholic Church*."—"And I believe that this whole congregation is all holy, that is to say, that this Church, and all the parts and members of the same, be so purified and mundified, as well by Christ's most precious blood, as also by the godly presence, governance, and assistance of his Holy Spirit (which dwelleth and inhabiteth continually within the said congregation, and governeth and sanctifieth the same), that neither the lepry of heresy, or false and perverse doctrine, neither the filthiness of sin, neither the gates of hell, shall be able finally to prevail against them, or to pull *any of them* out of the hands and possession of Christ. And although God doth ofttimes suffer not only sin, error, and iniquity so to abound here in the world, and the congregation of the wicked to exercise such tyranny, cruelty, and persecution over this holy Church, and the members of the same, that it might seem the said Church to be utterly oppressed and extinguished, but also suffereth many and sundry of the members of the same holy Church to fall out from this body *for a season*, and to commit many grievous and horrible offences and crimes, for the which they deserve to be precided and excluded for a season from the communion of this holy Church; yet I believe assuredly, that God will *never utterly abject* this holy Church, nor *any of the members thereof*, but that the same doth and shall perpetually continue and endure here in this world, and that God shall at all times (yea when persecution is greatest and most fervent), be present with his Holy Spirit in the same Church, and preserve it all holy and undefiled, and shall keep, ratify, and hold sure all his promises made unto the same church or congregation; and finally, that all such members as be fallen out from the same by sin, shall at length rise again by penance, and *shall be restored and united again unto the same holy body*. And I believe assuredly, that in this holy Church, and with the members of the same (so long as they be militant, and living here in earth), there have been ever, and yet be, and ever shall be joined and mingled together, an infinite number of the evil and wicked people, which, although they be indeed the very members of the congregation of the wicked, and, as the Gospel calleth them, very weeds and chaff, evil fish and goats, and shall finally be judged to everlasting damnation; yet forasmuch as they do live in the common society or company of those which be the very quick and living members of Christ's mystical body, and outwardly do profess, receive, and consent with them for a season in the doctrine of the Gospel, and in the right using of the Sacraments, yea and ofttimes be endued with right excellent gifts of the Holy Ghost, they be to be accounted

and reputed here in this world to be in the number of the said very members of Christ's mystical body, so long as they be not by open sentence of excommunication precided and excluded from the same. *Not because they be such members in very deed*, but because the certain judgment and knowledge of that their state is by God's ordinance hidden and kept secret from all men's knowledge, and shall not be revealed until the time that Christ himself shall come at the world's end, and there shall manifest and declare his very kingdom, and who be the very true members of his body, and who be not. And I believe that this holy Church is Catholic, that is to say, that it cannot be coarcted or restrained within the limits or bonds [? bounds] of any one town, city, province, region, or country; but that it is dispersed and spread universally throughout all the whole world. Insomuch that in what part soever of the world, be it in Africa, Asia, or Europe, there may be found any number of people, of what sort, state, or condition soever they be, which do believe in one God the Father, creator of all things, and in one Lord Jesu Christ his son, and in one Holy Ghost, and do also profess and have all one faith, one hope, and one charity, according as is prescribed in Holy Scripture, and do all consent in the true interpretation of the same Scripture, and in the right use of the Sacraments of Christ; we may boldly pronounce and say, that there is this holy Church, the very espouse and body of Christ, the very kingdom of Christ, and the very temple of God."—"And I believe . . that like as our Saviour Christ is one person, and the only head of his mystical body, so this whole Catholic Church, Christ's mystical body, is but one body under this one head Christ. *And that the unity of this one Catholic Church is a* MERE SPIRITUAL UNITY, consisting in the points before rehearsed, that is to say, in the unity of Christ's faith, hope, and charity and in the unity of the right doctrine of Christ, and in the unity and uniform using of the Sacraments consonant unto the same doctrine."—"And I believe and trust assuredly, that *I am one of the members of this Catholic Church, and that God of his only mercy hath not only chosen and called me thereunto by his Holy Spirit, and by the efficacy of his Word and Sacraments, and hath inserted and united me into this universal body or flock, and hath made me his son and inheritor of his kingdom; but also that he shall of his like goodness, and by the operation of the Holy Ghost, justify me here in this world, and finally glorify me in Heaven.*" (pp. 52—57.)

From the paraphrase on the tenth Article.

"I believe that in this Catholic Church I, and all the lively and quick members of the same, shall continually, and from time to time,

so long as we shall live here on earth, obtain remission and forgiveness of all our sins, as well original as actual, by the merits of Christ's blood and his passion, and by the virtue and efficacy of Christ's Sacraments, instituted by him for that purpose, so oft as we shall worthily receive the same." (p. 58.)

From the paraphrase of the eleventh and twelfth Articles.

"And after that I shall be so risen again from death to life, I believe that I, and all true penitent sinners that ever died, or shall die, in the faith of Christ, shall then be perfectly sanctified, purified, and delivered from all contagion of sin, and from all corruption and mortality of the flesh, and shall have everlasting life in glory with God in his kingdom." (p. 60.)

From the "Notes and Observations" on the Creed, following the paraphrase.

"In the Ninth Article [that on the Church] many things be to be noted.

"First, that this word *church*, in Scripture, is taken sometime generally for the whole congregation of them that be christened and profess Christ's Gospel; and sometime it is taken for *the Catholic congregation, or number of them only which be chosen, called, and ordained to reign with Christ in everlasting life.*

"Second, it is to be noted, that the Church, in the first signification, is in Scripture compared sometime unto a field full of good corn and naughty weeds mingled together; and sometimes unto a net full of good fish and bad; &c. . . . .

"Thirdly, it is to be noted, that by these parables, and certain such other, rehearsed in Scripture, is signified, that *among them which be christened, and do profess Christ's Gospel*, and live in the common society and communion of the Sacraments of the Church, divers be indeed the very quick and living members of Christ's mystical body, and shall reign with him everlastingly in honour. And that the congregation or society of them is *the very field*, and they be the very good corn or seed, which Christ himself did sow. And *divers be indeed chaff*, or stinking and naughty weeds, sown by the devil; . . . the very members of the synagogue of the devil, and not the living members of Christ's mystical body.

"By these parables also it is signified, that in this present life these two sorts of people, good and bad, be continually mixed and mingled together in the Church, as it is taken in the first signification. And that the said members of the synagogue of the devil, so long as they grow in the same field wherein the good corn groweth, that is to say, so long as they do in outward appearance profess the

same faith of Christ which the *very members* of Christ's Church do profess, and do consent and agree with them outwardly in the doctrine of the Gospel, and in all other things appertaining unto Christ's religion; they must be accepted and reputed here in the world for the very members of Christ's mystical body; and that they ought not ne can be dissevered from them, until the day of judgment. . . . .

"Fourthly, it is to be noted, that of the Church as it is taken in the second manner of signification, it is said in Scripture that she is the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of God . . . . All which sentences, and divers such other, spoken in Scripture of the Church, be to be referred and verified of the Church in the second signification. And finally, *in this signification also the ninth Article of our Creed is to be understanded.* For surely it is necessary for our salvation to believe that that church or congregation, which containeth the very quick and living members of Christ's mystical body, and which shall reign everlastingly with him in heaven, is all holy and catholic; and that like as it hath been ever in the world, and yet is, so it shall continue for ever; and for ever is, and shall be unto the world's end, spiritually and inwardly renewed, quickened, governed, justified, and sanctified with the presence, and spiritual assistance, and graces of the Holy Ghost, and inwardly shall be connected and united together in one godly consent in charity, and in the true doctrine of Christ.

"And for confirmation hereof, it is also further to be noted and considered, that it is not only very necessary for all true Christian men to learn and know the certain notes and marks whereby the very true Church of Christ is discerned from the church or congregation of the wicked, which God hateth, and also what is the principal cause whereby they be made to be the very quick members of the Church of Christ; but it is also one of the greatest comforts that any Christian man can have, to believe and trust for certain that there is such a congregation, which containeth the very lively members of Christ's mystical body, and that he is a member of the same congregation: specially considering the great and excellent promises which Christ himself hath made unto the said congregation, being his own mystical body, and his own most dear and tenderly beloved espouse. . . . .

"Sixthly, it is to be noted, that although the lively members of this militant church be subject to the infirmities of their flesh, and fall ofttimes into error and sin, as was said before; yet they always in Scripture be called holy, as well because they be sanctified in the blood of Christ, and professing in their baptism to believe in God, and to forsake the devil and all his works, they be consecrated and dedicated unto Christ; as also for that they be from time to time

purged by the word of God, and by faith, hope, and charity, and by the exercise of other virtues; and finally shall be endued with such grace of the Holy Ghost, that they shall be clearly sanctified and purified from all filthiness, and shall be made the glorious espouse of Christ, shining in all cleanness, without having any spot, or wrinkle, or any other thing worthy to be reprehended.

"In the tenth Article it is to be noted, that divers interpreters of Holy Scripture do diversely interpretate the first part thereof, that is to say, communion of Saints. For some of them do refer it unto the ninth Article, and do take it as a clause added to declare and explain what is signified by these words, *the Catholic Church;* and so they do conjoin this clause with that that went before in this sense; I believe that this Catholic Church is the communion, that is to say, the multitude, or the commonalty, or the commonwealth of *saints only*, that is to say, of those which be under the kingdom of Christ, and be governed and sanctified with his Holy Spirit, and be prepared to come to everlasting life . . . . And some doctors do expound it to signify that treasure of the Church which is common equally unto all the members of the same. And those doctors which be of this opinion do interpretate that treasure to be nothing else but the grace, that is to say, the mercy, the goodness, and the favour of God in this world, and glory in the world to come. They say also, that this grace of God is the common treasure of all *the elect people of God*, and that our poverty is so extreme, that of ourselves, without this grace, we should be utterly nothing. They say further, that the effect and virtue of this grace is to make us able to rise from sin and flee from sin, to work good works, to receive the reward of everlasting glory, to have and retain the true sense and understanding of Holy Scripture, and to endue us with Christian faith, hope, and charity. Finally, they say that *this grace worketh all those effects* IN THE ELECT PEOPLE OF GOD, *by two special instruments, which be, the Word of God and his Sacraments.* And forasmuch as both the Word and the Sacraments have all their efficacy by and through the might and operation of the Holy Ghost, and forasmuch also as this Holy Ghost dwelleth and abideth *only in the Catholic Church, and in the members of the same*, and worketh none of these effects out of the Church: they think that by this clause, *communion of saints*, is meant here the treasure of the Church; and that this treasure is nothing else but the Holy Ghost himself, and his graces," &c. (pp. 75—80.)

These remarkable passages, overthrowing the very foundations of that Laudean system of theology pressed upon us by some parties under the name of "Church principles," supply us with most important evidence as to the progress made by Cranmer

and his party, even at this early period, in Protestant doctrine on the fundamental points here treated of. And the work, though reprinted, is in the hands of so few persons, that I feel persuaded that no apology will be thought necessary for the length of the extracts.

The reader will probably at once see the importance of some passages in these extracts in showing the doctrine then entertained on the point which is more particularly the subject of these pages, and in that view I shall have to refer to them again hereafter; but I adduce them here as evidence of the *character* of the doctrine maintained by Cranmer and his co-reformers even so early as 1537. And we need not be surprised at finding, as we shall hereafter, that the work was so unsatisfactory to the Popish party, and (through the influence of Gardiner, the Popish bishop of Winchester,) with the King, that it was soon superseded by one of a very different kind, the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," "set forth by the King's Majesty" in 1543.

And I would now call the reader's attention to some of Archbishop Cranmer's Annotations upon the King's proposed corrections of the "Institution," written not long after its publication, as further elucidating Cranmer's views.

To the words,—"I believe assuredly, that God will never utterly abject this *holy Church*, nor any *of the members thereof*, but that the same doth and shall perpetually continue and endure here in this world," the King proposed to add these words, "if fault be not in themselves;" to which Cranmer thus objects, "this article speaketh only of *the elect*, in whom finally no fault shall be, but they *shall perpetually continue and endure.*"*

Again, to the words, "that all such members as be fallen out from the same by sin, shall at length rise again by penance, and shall be restored and united again unto the same holy body," the King proposed to add,—"if wilfully and obstinately they withstand not his calling;" to which Cranmer objects, "Likewise *the elect shall not wilfully and obstinately withstand God's calling.*"†

Again, on the words,—"I believe, that I being united and corporated as a living member into this Catholic Church (as

* Cranmer's Works, P. S. ed. vol. 2. p. 91. † Ib. p. 91.

undoubtedly I trust that I am), not only Christ himself, being Head of this body, and the infinite treasure of all goodness, and all the holy saints and members of the same body do and shall necessarily help me," &c.,—the king proposed to add, after the words "I am," these words, "and so continuing;" to which Cranmer objects, "*Continuance is comprehended in faith; for if I believe not that I shall continue in the Holy Catholic Church, I cannot believe that I shall have any benefit by Christ.*"*

Again, on the words, "I believe that in this Catholic Church I and all the lively and quick members of the same, shall continually and from time to time, so long as we shall live here on earth, obtain remission and forgiveness of all our sins, as well original as actual, by the merits of Christ's blood and his passion, and by the virtue and efficacy of Christ's sacraments, instituted by Him for that purpose, so oft as we shall *worthily* receive the same," the King proposed to add after the words "on earth," "following Christ's precepts, or when we fall repent our fault;" to which Cranmer objects,—"The elect, of whom is here spoken, *will* follow Christ's precepts and rise again when they fall, AND THE RIGHT FAITH CANNOT BE *without following of Christ's precepts, and repentance after falling.* See the fourth annotation. Therefore in my judgment it were better to say thus: 'The elect shall follow Christ's precepts, or when they fall, they shall repent and rise again, and obtain remission,' &c."† In the "fourth annotation" here referred to, the nature of true Christian faith is fully pointed out, and two important points strongly insisted upon as characteristic of it, namely, its *indefectibility* and its *appropriating character.* The following extract will sufficiently show this. On the words, "I believe also and profess, that he is my very God, my Lord and my Father, and that I am his servant and his own son by adoption and grace, and the right inheritor of his kingdom," the King had proposed, that instead of the words "the right inheritor," the following should be substituted, "as long as I persevere in his precepts and laws one of the right inheritors." Cranmer objects to this change, in these words,—

"This book speaketh of the pure Christian faith unfeigned, which

---

* Cranmer's Works, pp. 91, 92. † Ib. 91, 92.

is without colour, as well in heart, as in mouth. He that hath this faith, converteth from his sin, repenteth him . . . . and trusteth assuredly, that for Christ's sake he [God] will and doth remit his sin, withdraweth his indignation, delivereth him from hell, from the power of the infernal spirits, taketh him to his mercy, and maketh him his own son and his own heir . . . . For the more large declaration of the pure Christian faith, it is to be considered, that there is a general faith, which all that be Christian, as well good as evil, have: as to believe that God is . . . . And all these things even the devils also believe . . . . But they have not the right Christian faith, that *their own sins* by Christ's redemption be pardoned and forgiven, that *themselves* by Christ be delivered from God's wrath, and be made his beloved children and heirs of his kingdom to come. The other faith hath [have] all devils and wicked Christian people that be his members: but this pure Christian faith have none, but those that *truly belong to Christ*, and be the *very members of his body*, and endeavor themselves to persevere in his precepts and laws . . . . If the profession of *our faith of the remission of* OUR OWN *sins* enter within us into the deepness of our hearts, there it must needs kindle a warm fire of love in our hearts towards God . . . . and, in summa, a firm intent and purpose to do all that is good and leave all that is evil. This is a very right, pure, perfect, lively, Christian, hearty and justifying 'faith which worketh by love,' as St. Paul saith, and suffereth no venom or poison of sin to remain within the heart. . . . This being declared, in my judgment it shall not be necessary to interline or insert in many places, where we protest our pure Christian faith, these words or sentences that be newly added, viz., 'I being in will to follow God's precepts'. . . . . '*If I continue a Christian life*,' 'If I follow Christ's precepts'. . . . . and such other like sentences or clauses conditional, *which to* THE RIGHT FAITH *need not to be added, for without these conditions is* NO RIGHT FAITH." *

The appropriating character of true faith is, as we have seen, strongly insisted on in the "Institution" in several places. But there is also another passage, which, as well as the remarks of the King and Cranmer on it, are of importance in this inquiry. The "Institution" says,—

"The penitent must conceive *certain hope and* FAITH *that God will forgive him his sins, and repute him justified,* AND OF THE NUMBER OF HIS ELECT CHILDREN, not for the worthiness of any

* Cranmer's Works, pp. 84–86.

merit or work done by the penitent, but for the only merits of the blood and passion of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

On the latter words the King proposed adding "only" after "not," and "chiefly" after "but;" to which Cranmer replies,—

"These two words may not be put in this place in anywise: for they signify that our election and justification cometh partly of our merits, though chiefly it cometh of the goodness of God. But certain it is, that our election cometh only and wholly of the benefit and grace of God, for the merits of Christ's passion, and for no part of our merits and good works.*

I do not understand how any one can deny, that these passages are decisive as to Cranmer's views, and those taught by public authority in the "Institution," on the following points, (1) that election is wholly and solely of God's free and sovereign mercy, and that such as are elected continue Christ's disciples to the end; (2) that true Christian faith is enjoyed by such only, and is indefectible; (3) that true Christian faith is an appropriating faith, that is, that he who has it in exercise believes that his own sins have been remitted through Christ's atonement, and that he is and will continue a child of God; (4) that those who ultimately perish *never were* members of the true Catholic Church, or mystical body of Christ, that Church and body (the Catholic Church of the Creed) being composed exclusively of those who will ultimately be saved. The phraseology by which the difference between the two is marked I shall consider hereafter.

I leave others to give a name to this system. But such was Cranmer's.

Again, among the persons promoted by Cranmer at this period was Lancelot Ridley, who was made by the Archbishop, in 1541, one of the six preachers in Canterbury Cathedral.† The following passages from his works will show clearly the theological school to which he belonged.

"Signs of God's predestination are these First, God of his goodness electeth and chooseth whom he will, only of his mere

* Cranmer's Works, p. 95.
† Strype's Cranmer, 94, or Oxf. Ed. 134.

mercy and goodness, without all the deservings of man; whom he hath elected, he calleth them for the most part by preaching of the Gospel, and by the hearing of the word of God, to faith in Christ Jesus: and through faith he justifieth them, forgiveth sins, and maketh them obedient to hear his word with gladness, to do that thing that God's word commandeth them to do in their state and calling. . . . . Of the contrary part, whosoever be not glad to hear the word of God, but despise it, &c. . . . it is a token that they be not the children of salvation, but of perdition and eternal damnation: of these works that follow, we may have a conjecture, who be ordained of God to be saved, and who to be damned."*

"If these be true, as they be in very deed, then methinks that they err, and are to be blamed, that say, that we, of our free will, may do good, may *assent and receive the grace of God offered to all men, or not assent to it and forsake it, if we list, and at our own pleasure and free will;* or else our will, they say, cannot be free, or called a free will. Of these men I would ask one question; whether to assent to the grace of God offered, and to receive it, is good or no? And if it be good, as I trust none will deny, then it is of God the Father, and not of us." (James i.)†

This is the doctrine, be it observed, of one whom Archbishop Cranmer, in 1541, made one of the six preachers in Canterbury Cathedral; so that even at this early period of Cranmer's career, what would *now* be called rank Calvinism was preached under his authority, and through his appointment, in his Cathedral.

But in 1551, the year before the Articles were drawn up, Cranmer himself speaks (as might be expected) yet more clearly.

"And yet I know this to be true, that Christ is present with his *holy Church*, which is his holy *elected people*, and shall be with them to the world's end, leading and governing them with his holy Spirit, and teaching them all truth necessary for their salvation. And whensoever any such be gathered together in his name, there is he among them, and he shall not suffer the gates of hell to prevail against them. For although he may suffer them by their own frailness, FOR A TIME to *err*, *fall*, and to die; yet *finally*, *neither Satan*, *hell*, *sin*, *nor eternal death*, *shall prevail against them*. . . . . But this holy Church is so unknown to the world, that no man can discern it,

---

* Comm. on Ephes. (i. 3, 4.) first published in 1540, reprinted in Richmond's Fathers, ii. 31, 32.

† Comm. on Phil. (i. 3—8,) first published about 1536, reprinted, ib. ii. 188, 189.

but God alone, who only searcheth the hearts of all men, and knoweth his true children from other that be bastards. This Church is 'the pillar of truth,' because it resteth upon God's word. But as for the open known Church, and the outward face thereof, it is not the pillar of truth, otherwise than that it is, as it were, a register or treasury to keep the books of God's holy will. . . . And the holy Church of Christ is but a small herd or flock in comparison to the great multitude of them that follow Satan and Antichrist; as Christ himself saith, and the word of God, and the course of the world from the beginning until this day, hath declared."*

There can be no mistake as to the meaning of this passage.

And from this extract we may judge of the correctness of the statements of Archbishop Laurence,† that the doctrine of our Church is, that the elect people of God are *all the baptized.*

One of the earliest acts of Archbishop Cranmer after the accession of Edward VI. was to call *Peter Martyr* over to this country, to aid him in the work of Reformation; and after a brief residence with himself at Lambeth, to place him, in 1548, as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. That it was by the express invitation of Archbishop Cranmer that he came over to this country, is testified both by Archbishop Parker (in a passage to which I shall refer presently), and by Melchior Adam, in his Life of Peter Martyr.‡ I cannot therefore but remark here upon the unfairness of the way in which the late Archbishop Laurence endeavours to get rid of any argument respecting the tendencies of Cranmer's doctrine, drawn from his patronage of Peter Martyr, by representing that

---

* Answ. to Smith, App. to Answ. to Gardiner. Wks. i. 376, 377. See also preface to "Defence of True and Cath. Doct. of Sacr." published 1550, in Wks. i. 5.

† See his Bampton Lectures.

‡ Quia ex academiis ministri Ecclesiarum prodeunt, eas cum primis diligenter reformandas duxit [i. e. Cranmerus]: quo deinde ex his purus succus sanæ doctrinæ in singulas regni partes derivaretur. Quia vero Petrus Martyr doctorum virorum judicio ob singularem eruditionem et incredibilem multarum rerum peritiam, unus omnium ad hoc munus maxime idoneus videbatur, ab Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi, de voluntate regis, vocatus est. Itaque sub exitum Novembris anni quadragesimi septimi, permissu senatus, Argentina ubi jam quinquennium docuerat in Angliam discessit, comitante eum Bernardino Ochino, qui et ipse quoque ab eodem Archiepiscopo vocatus fuerat. (Melch. Adam. Vitæ, in Vit. Theol. exteror. p. 21. Francof. 1706, fol.)

patronage as "the bare circumstance of his being *favoured with an* ASYLUM *in this country,*"* and this in the midst of quotations from Melchior Adam and Archbishop Parker's Antiq. Britann., which show Abp. Laurence to have been well acquainted with both those works.†

Now it is notorious that the sentiments of Peter Martyr were what would now be called Calvinistic;‡ nor can it be supposed (as Archbishop Laurence would wish us to think) that Cranmer was ignorant what his sentiments were when he invited him over, or at any rate when, after some months' residence with himself at Lambeth, he sent him to be Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. And in the very point in which Archbishop Laurence maintains the opposition of Cranmer's mature views to those of Peter Martyr, evidence is producible that he is mistaken. He says, "It is likewise *certain,* that both immediately before and *after* his arrival here, the sentiments of Cranmer were completely at variance with his, upon one of the most important topics of the day, viz. the Sacramental Presence." (p. 248.) Now the fact is precisely the contrary, for in a letter of Bartholomew Traheron (made in 1551 Dean of Chichester) to Bullinger, dated so early as Sept. 28, 1548, it is said, "That you may add yet more to the praises of God, you must know that

---

* Bampton Lect. 3rd ed. p. 248.

† The refutation of a good sized octavo volume cannot of course be attempted in a corner of a chapter of a work on a different subject; but (while I desire to express myself respectfully towards the esteemed author) I cannot but enter my humble protest against the *remarkable partiality* and *superficial* character of the work above referred to (Archbishop Laurence's Bampton Lectures), and consequently the erroneous nature of the view it gives of the subject of which it treats. And I trust that the few facts I am about to mention above, will be sufficient to put the reader on his guard against its statements.

‡ I use the term Calvinistic as that which is now commonly applied to that view of doctrine which generally prevailed among the "Reformed" Churches of the Continent at the period of which we are speaking. There were points in the system of Calvin (strictly speaking) about which there was much difference of opinion, both here and elsewhere. But I am here speaking of the broad features of the prevailing system; that is, its teaching on the points of Election, Predestination, and Final Perseverance. The views of Peter Martyr are so well known that it can hardly be necessary to prove them by extracts, but I would refer the reader to (among his other works) his Commentary on the Romans, originally delivered at his University Lectures, and afterwards published (Lat. Tiguri. 1559, &c. Engl. Lond. 1568), particularly his remarks on the 9th chapter.

Latimer has come over to *our opinion* respecting the true doctrine of the eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other Bishops, who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans." (Orig. Lett. vol. i. p. 322.) And in another from the same to the same, dated Dec. 31, 1548,—"On the 14th of December, if I mistake not, a disputation was held at London concerning the eucharist, in the presence of almost all the nobility of England. The argument was sharply contested by the Bishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained *your opinion* upon the subject....I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters, have altogether come over to our side." (Ib. p. 323.) And in a letter of Bishop Hooper to Bullinger, in Dec. 1549, it is said, "The Archbishop of Canterbury entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Supper, and is now very friendly towards myself. He has some articles of religion, to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe, or else a licence for teaching is not granted them; and in these *his sentiments respecting the eucharist are* pure and religious, and *similar to yours in Switzerland.* We desire nothing more for him but a firm and manly spirit." (Orig. Lett. relat. to Reform. vol. i. pp. 71, 72, Park. Soc. ed.) He repeats this in another letter to the same party, written in Feb. 1550. (Ib. p. 76.)

But, to silence at once and for ever such representations, let Cranmer himself be heard. In his Answer to Dr. Smith, published in 1551, he thus speaks,—

"After this he (i. e. Dr Smith) falleth to railing, lying and slandering of M. Peter Martyr, a man of that excellent learning and godly living, that he passeth D. Smith as far as the sun in his clear light passeth the moon being in the eclipse.

"'Peter Martyr,' saith he, 'at his first coming to Oxford, when he was but a Lutherian in this matter, taught as D. Smith now doth. But when he came once to the Court, and saw that doctrine mis'liked them that might do him hurt in his living, he anon after turned his tippet, and sang another song.'

"*Of M. Peter Martyr's opinion and judgment in this matter, no man can better testify than I; forasmuch as he lodged within my house long before he came to Oxford, and I had with him many con-*

ferences in that matter, and know that he was then of the same mind that he is now, and as he defended after openly in Oxford, and hath written in his book. And if D Smith understood him otherwise in his lectures at the beginning, it was for lack of knowledge, for that then D. Smith understood not the matter, nor yet doth not, as it appeareth by this foolish and unlearned book, which he hath now set out: *no more than he understood my book of the Catechism, and therefore reporteth untruly of me, that I in that book did set forth the real presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament.* Unto which false report I have answered in my fourth book, the eighth chapter. But this I confess of myself, that not long before I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the real presence, as I was many years past in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass," &c. . . . " But as for Doctor Peter Martyr, hath he sought to please man for advantage? who, having a great yearly revenue in his own country, forsook all for Christ's sake, and for the truth and glory of God came into strange countries, where he had neither land nor friends, but as God of his goodness, who never forsaketh them that put their trust in him, provided for him." (Cranmer's Works, P. S. ed. vol. 1, pp. 373, 374.)

I will only add, that Peter Martyr was one of three (the others being Dr. Rowland Taylor, and Walter Haddon) whom the Archbishop associated with himself in drawing up a revision of the ecclesiastical laws,* (including the most important points of doctrine) and that it was Peter Martyr whom the Archbishop afterwards selected in the reign of Queen Mary to aid him in defending the religion and Book of Common Prayer established here in the reign of Edward VI., when he challenged the Romanists to a public disputation upon the subject. But this fact I shall notice more particularly elsewhere.

Strype remarks, therefore,—

"As for the learned Italian, Peter Martyr . . . there was not only an acquaintance between him and our Archbishop, but a great and cordial intimacy and friendship: for *of him he made particular use in the steps he took in our Reformation.* And whensoever he might be spared from his public readings in Oxford, the Archbishop used to send for him, to confer with him about the weightiest matters. This Calvin took notice of, and signified to him by letter how much

* See Strype's Cranmer, i. 191, 192, Oxf. ed.

he rejoiced that he made use of the counsels of that excellent man. And when the reformation of the ecclesiastical laws was in effect wholly devolved upon Cranmer, he appointed him and Gualter Haddon, and Dr. Rowland Taylor, his chaplain, and no more, to manage that business. . . . and in that bold and brave challenge he made in the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, to justify, against any man whatsoever, every part of King Edward's Reformation, he nominated and made choice of Martyr therein to be one of his assistants in that disputation, if any would undertake it with him."*

The invitation of Cranmer to Peter Martyr was followed, in 1548, by one from the same quarter to Martin Bucer, P. Martyr's fellow-labourer at Strasburg,† and who, though, in the matter of the eucharist, more ambiguous in his phrascology, was in substance entirely in agreement with him in doctrine; but whom Archbishop Laurence has, by some extraordinary mistake, put down as a Lutheran, and hence, as we shall see hereafter, used arguments grounded upon Bucer's case, to the infinite damage of his own cause.

To illustrate the general character of his doctrine, I will here give some extracts from his Commentary on the Romans, published in 1536, and *dedicated to Cranmer*, so that his views must have been well known to the Archbishop before he sent for him to come over.

"From a misunderstanding of the holy Fathers there has sometimes arisen that error, that our good works are in some manner the cause of our predestination; namely, that God foreseeing that his people will embrace his offered grace, and make a good use of his gifts, does for this cause predestine and predetermine them to salvation. But this error even St. Thomas rightly refutes, P. 1, q. 23. . . . . What in truth can God foresee in us, who are of nothing, except what he himself shall have resolved of his goodness to give us? Therefore there can be nothing at all in us which God could look upon when predestinating us to be of the number of those who shall be saved. For his own sake he does and gives to us all things."‡

---

* Strype's Cranmer, p. 413, or Oxf. ed. 593.

† Bucer taught theology at Strasburg for twenty years, and it was at his invitation, and procurement of a salary from the authorities of Strasburg for him, that Peter Martyr joined him. (See Melch. Adam.)

‡ "Ex sanctis patribus non recte intellectis extitit aliquando is error, nostra bona opera esse aliquo modo causam nostræ prædestinationis, quòd Deus prævidens suos gratiam suam oblatam amplexaturos, et donis

"Moreover that that fiction,—that we have so much strength to live a good life, that, when called by the Gospel and assisted by that grace of God which he constantly offers and gives to all men, we can follow God so calling us, and embrace his offered grace,—is such, that he who will defend it, must necessarily deny that there is a God, is clear from hence: all of us, when we mention God, understand the Author of all good; and we doubt not that he who affirms that anything good is not effected by God, denies God."*

"Everything that God simply wills happens of necessity; for whatsoever he would, that did he in heaven and in earth; but what things he wills and approves of in the life of his people, those things he lays before many, nay all, in his external word; which things nevertheless he does not simply will that those should embrace who are of the many called, not of the few chosen: who, indeed, oppose that will of God which he wills to be laid before all, but to find place only in the elect; but when God simply wills this very thing in them, they individually of themselves obey the will of God, and do not oppose it. But just as this question, with what justice God can simply will one to be saved, another only to be called to salvation, but simply to be lost, is not to be inquired into by us; so neither is that,—how it becomes God to call to salvation and testify that it is his will that they should obey his call and be saved, whom nevertheless he simply wills to hear and not understand, to see and not perceive. For it is certain, that for any one to obey the call of God, which is the beginning of the whole of salvation, is the gift and work of God, which God bestows upon some and denies to others. For he counsels so as to persuade the former, but not so the latter; and they whom he persuades cannot but follow him who calls them, nor can they follow whom he does not persuade. Therefore his will beyond doubt is, that some should hear and listen attentively to him,

---

suis probè usuros, eos hac de causa prædestinet et ad salutem præfiniat. Sed hunc errorem etiam D. Thomas recte confutat, P. 1. q. 23 . . . . Deus sane in nobis, qui ex nihilo sumus, quid prævideat, nisi quod ipse nobis ex sua bonitate statuerit donare? Nihil igitur in nobis prorsus esse potest, quod respiceret Deus, nos inter salvandos præfiniendo: propter se ipsum facit, donatque nobis omnia." (Metaphr. et Enarr. in Ep. Pauli ad. Rom. c. 8, first published, Argentinæ, 1536. I quote from the edition published, Basil. 1562. fol. p. 412.)

* Jam commentum istuc, nos tantum habere virium ad recte vivendum, ut vocati per Evangelium, et ea Domini gratia adjuti, quam omnibus mortalibus perpetuo offert et donat, possimus vocantem Deum sequi, et oblatam gratiam amplecti, ejusmodi esse, ut qui illud tueri velit, necessario neget, Deum esse, inde perspicuum est. Omnes, cum Deum nominamus, intelligimus authorem omnis boni; et qui aliquid boni non effici a Deo affirmet, eum non dubitant [dubitamus] negare Deum. (Id. ib. in c. x. p. 458.)

and that others should hear and despise him. But why God should thus will and do, St. Augustine has only two things to answer: 'O the depth of the riches!' and 'Is there unrighteousness with God?' adding: He who is displeased with that answer must seek men more learned, but let him take heed lest he find presumptuous men.' De Sp. et lit. c. 34. Nor will any who are truly pious give any other answer."*

The letter (dated Oct. 2, 1548) in which Cranmer's invitation was conveyed to Bucer, is still extant, and expresses Cranmer's earnest desire for Bucer's aid in this country in furthering the cause of the Reformation. After expressing his sympathy for the state of Germany, he says,—

"I doubt not but God will hear this and similar groanings of the pious; and will preserve and defend *the true doctrine which has been hitherto faithfully propagated in your churches* against all the ragings of the devil and the world. . . . . To you therefore, my Bucer, our kingdom will be by far the safest refuge, in which, by the blessing of God, the seeds of true doctrine have begun to be sprinkled with good success. *Come therefore to us, and give yourself to us as a labourer in the Lord's harvest.* You will not be of less use to the Catholic Church of God when with us, than if you retained your old place of abode . . . Therefore, laying aside all delay, come

---

* Fit sane necessario quicquid Deus vult simpliciter. Quæcunque enim voluit fecit in cœlo et in terra. At quæ vult et probat in vita suorum, ea multis, imo omnibus proponit externo verbo; quæ tamen non vult simpliciter eos amplecti, quos decet esse ex multis vocatis, non ex paucis electis: qui voluntati quidem Dei, quam exponi vult omnibus, obtemere autem tantùm in electis, adversantur; sed cum Deus hoc ipsum in eis vult simpliciter, Dei voluntati singulariter de se inserviunt, non obsistunt. Atqui sicut hoc, qua justitia Deus alium velit salvum simpliciter, alium vocari tantùm ad salutem, perditum vero simpliciter, vestigandum a nobis non est; ita nec illud, qui deceat Deum vocare ad salutem et testari suam voluntatem esse, ut vocationi pareant atque serventur, quos tamen simpliciter vult audire nec intelligere, videre nec cognoscere. Certum enim est, ut vocationi Dei quis pareat, quod est initium totius salutis, id esse donum et opus Dei; quod Deus aliis largitur, aliis negat. Illis enim suadet ut persuadeat; his non ita: et non possunt non sequi vocantem quibus persuadet, nec sequi quibus non persuadet. Vult itaque omnino alios audire se et exaudire, alios audire et contemnere. Cur autem ita velit et faciat Deus, D. Augustinus duo tantùm habet quæ respondeat. O altitudo divitiarum! Ft. Numquid iniquitas est apud Deum? Addens; Cui responsio ista displicet, quærat doctiores, sed caveat ne inveniat præsumptores. De Sp. et lit. c. 34. Nec aliud respondebunt, quicunque verè pii sunt. (Id. ib. p. 460.)

to us as soon as possible. We will show that nothing can be more pleasant or acceptable to us than the presence of Bucer." *

And when Bucer replied, apparently declining the invitation, Peter Alexander, at the direction of the Archbishop, wrote from Lambeth a more pressing letter to him in March, 1549,† begging him to come over.‡ In consequence of this second letter, Bucer arrived in this country in April, and with him came, also by the invitation of Cranmer,§ Paul Fagius. Both were entertained by the Archbishop, at Lambeth, until the following Autumn, when Bucer was placed as Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, and Fagius, in the same place, as Professor of Hebrew.

In this post he publicly maintained the same doctrine that he had previously advocated, as appears by his Lectures on the Ephesians,‖ and his public Disputations in the University, afterwards published.¶

From the former I give a few extracts as a specimen :—

"The first point of theology which Paul treats of in this Epistle is concerning our election to the eternal inheritance. For in this Epistle he recalls to the memory of the Ephesians the blessings which God had bestowed on them. Therefore he begins from the first and greatest of all, namely from the election and eternal acceptance with which he received them and all his own people, before all time, to life and eternal salvation. The efficient cause of this, he tells us, is

---

* Nec dubito quin Deus hoc et similes piorum gemitus exauditurus sit; et veram doctrinam, quæ hactenus in vestris ecclesiis sincere propagata est, et conservaturus et defensurus sit adversus omnes diaboli et mundi furores. . . . Tibi igitur, mi Bucere, portus longe tutissimus erit nostrum regnum, in quo, Dei beneficio, semina veræ doctrinæ feliciter spargi cœperunt. Veni igitur ad nos, et te nobis operarium præsta in messe Domini. Non minus proderis Catholicæ Dei ecclesiæ cum apud nos fueris, quam si pristinas sedes retineres. . . .Omni igitur semota cunctatione, quam primum ad nos venias. Ostendemus nobis præsentia Buceri nihil gratius aut jucundius esse posse. (Cranmer's Works, P. S. ed. vol. 2, p. 424. Also Buceri Scripta Angl. p. 190 : and Strype's Cranmer, Doc. in App. xliii.)

† See it in Buceri Scripta Anglic. p. 191.

‡ See Strype's Life of Cranmer, i. 280. Oxf. Ed.

§ See Life of Fagius by Melch. Adam, and Peter Alexander's Lett. to him, dated March 24, 1549. (Orig. Lett. p. 329.)

‖ Prælectiones in Epist. ad Ephes. Basil, 1562. fol.

¶ In his Scripta Anglicana. Basil. 1577. fol.

the mere grace of God and the merit of Christ. For the word *grace* in this place signifies the gratuitous favour and good will of God; although the gratuitous gifts of God are also called in Scripture, by a figure, grace. The final causes are, sanctification of the life, and the glory of God. For the sanctification of our life is not the principal end of our election, but the glory itself of God; on account of which, and for which, was the creation of all things, and is our regeneration."*

"Ye ought to be grateful to him, who gratuitously gave you all things, election, adoption, vocation, faith, &c., which things are sure with God. Let us nevertheless take care, that, so far as pertains to us, they may also be more and more sure, although all the elect must be saved, and cannot wholly fall away. But we must endeavour not even for a moment to fall away through our sins."†

"The term election is used in two senses. Sometimes for an external election to any office; as, 'Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?' . . . Again election is sometimes used in this sense, that there is an appointment, made by the mere grace of God, of certain men from the common corrupt mass to a knowledge of the will of God, and ultimately to eternal life: and of this election the discourse is here, and of it Christ speaks when he says, 'I know whom I have chosen.' If the recollection and consideration of this election should be taken away from us, how should we resist the devil? For as often as the devil tries our faith, and he is always trying it, then we ought always to resort to our election, and to think of it, and so to think of it as to exclude all doubt. For if we lack this assurance of faith, if we are not persuaded of it, we cannot look for eternal life; we cannot acknowledge God for our

---

* Primus locus Theologiæ quem Paulus hac Epistola tractat, est de electione nostri ad hæreditatem æternam. Revocat enim hac Epistola Ephesiis in memoriam beneficia, quæ Deus illis contulerat. Ergo ab omnium primo et maximo incipit, nimirum ab electione et complexu æterno, quo ipsos et omnes suos, ante omne tempus, ad vitam et salutem æternam complexus est. Hujus causam efficientem dicit esse meram gratiam Dei, et meritum Christi. Gratiæ enim vocabulum, gratuitum Dei favorem et benevolentiam hoc loco significat: quanquam et gratuita Dei dona per figuram etiam gratia dicantur in Scripturis. Causæ finales sunt, vitæ sanctificatio, et gloria Dei. Non enim est vitæ nostræ sanctificatio præcipuus finis electionis nostræ, sed ipsa gloria Dei, propter quam, et ad quam omnium fuit conditio, et nostri est regeneratio. (Prælect. in Ep. ad Ephes. c. 1. Basil. 1562. fol. p. 19.)

† Debetis ei esse grati, qui vobis gratuitò donavit omnia, electionem, adoptionem, vocationem, fidem, &c. Quæ apud Deum sunt firma. Studeamus tamen nos, ut etiam quantum ad nos magis ac magis sint firma, *quanquam electi serventur omnes, nec penitus excidant.* Sed danda etiam opera est, ne vel ad momentum excidamus per nostra peccata. (Ib. p. 20.)

Father and Christ for our Redeemer: in short, there can be no solid piety and true love of God in us."*

"Election is the mere gift of God. Therefore it is grace, and not a reward. Let Augustine be read; he certainly has the clearest and most manifest testimonies. Election therefore is, the appointment and certain loving kindness of God, from eternity, before the world was made, by which God separates to eternal life those whom he chooses to have compassion upon, out of the whole race of lost mankind, of his evidently gratuitous mercy, before they can do anything either of good or evil. It is, I say, certain and unchangeable, through Jesus Christ the only begotton Son of God, and our Mediator, appointed from eternity Head of the Church, and reconciler, according to his own eternal and immutable purpose, that he might adopt us for sons and heirs, and *regenerate us to a new life*, that we might be holy," &c.†

"God in election follows only his own purpose, his own glory, love, compassion, and his Son Jesus Christ. But you will say, If nothing on the part of man concurs, man is rendered comparatively careless. It is not by any means so: nay, he who firmly believes that this comes to pass from the mere will, love, and compassion of God, is the more excited to good works: but they who do not believe take from everything the liberty to commit sin. In the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans also, it is shown, with the utmost clearness, that election is gratuitous. And this argument Augustine

---

* Nomen electionis bifariam accipitur. Aliquando pro externa ad aliquod munus electione: ut, Nonne duodecim vos elegi, et unus est ex vobis diabolus?.... Rursus electio aliquando accipitur, ut sit aliquorum hominum ex communi perdita massa, ad cognitionem voluntatis Dei, et demum ad vitam æternam designatio, *ex mera gratia Dei*: et de ea electione hic sermo est, et de ea loquitur Christus, ubi dicit: Ego scio quos elegerim. Si hujus electionis memoria et meditatio nobis auferretur, bone Deus, quomodo resisteremus Diabolo? Quoties enim Diabolus tentat fidem nostram, nunquam autem non tentat, tunc semper ad electionem est nobis recurrendum, et de ea cogitandum, atque ita cogitandum, ut omnem dubitationem excludamus. Nam si hac fidei certitudine careamus, si de ea persuasi non sumus, non possumus vitam æternam expectare; Deum pro patre, et Christum pro redemptore non possumus agnoscere; nihil denique solidæ pietatis, et veræ dilectionis Dei in nobis esse potest. (Ib. p. 21.)

† Electio merum est donum Dei. Ergo gratia, et non merces. Legatur Augustinus, habet certe clarissima et evidentissima testimonia. Est itaque electio, destinatio et certa Dei miseratio ab æterno ante mundum constitutum, qua Deus eos, quorum vult misereri, ex universo perditorum hominum genere, ad vitam æternam secernit, ex planè liberali misericordia, priusquam quicquam possint boni aut mali facere. Certa, inquam, est, et immutabilis, per Jesum Christum unigenitum filium Dei et nostrum mediatorem, ab æterno destinatum caput Ecclesiæ, ac reconciliatorem, secundum æternum et immutabile propositum suum, ut nos adoptaret in filios et hæredes, et *in novam vitam regeneraret*, ut sancti essemus, &c. (Ib. p. 23.)

admirably presses. That also is similar; I have chosen you, ye have not chosen me. Therefore no preparatory or any other works have saved those who are saved, but grace alone. Moreover these words of the text proclaim the righteousness of God; namely, that the reprobate remain, by the just judgment of God, reprobate. . . . . If therefore any one object, If nothing takes place on the part of man, as it respects election, which concurs with the divine work, God seems to be unjust, because he does not give equally to all the same reward,—we must answer him, That there is no similarity between God's thoughts and ours. For we who have a law of right conduct ought truly to follow this law, if we would not be unrighteous. But God is bound by no law of this kind, is constrained by no precept, to bless the corrupt and confer salvation upon the undeserving," &c. &c.*

It would be easy to multiply such passages a hundredfold.

On his death, at the close of 1551, Matthew Parker, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, preached his funeral sermon, and praised him particularly for the *soundness and excellence of his doctrine;* in which (he tells us), as well as the holiness of his life, he was *a burning and shining light* in the Church of Christ for many years.†

And at a subsequent period we have a similar testimony to him from another of our most able primates, Archbishop Whitgift. Thus he speaks of him in his reply to Cartwright (who had found fault with some of his remarks),—

---

* Deus in electione suum tantummodo propositum sequitur, suam gloriam, charitatem, misericordiam, et filium suum Jesum Christum. Sed dices: Si nihil hominis concurrit, redditur homo remissior. Nequaquam ita est: imo qui firmiter credit ex mera Dei voluntate, charitate, misericordia hoc provenire, magis accenditur ad bona opera: sed qui non credunt, hi omnia rapiunt in libertatem peccandi. In nono quoque capite ad Romanos, gratuitam esse electionem ostenditur adeò clarè ut magis non possit. Quod argumentum optime urget Augustinus. Simile est et illud: Ego vos elegi, non vos me elegistis. Non ergo præparatoria aut alia ulla opera eos servarunt, qui servati sunt, sed sola gratia. Prædicant præterea hæc verba textus justitiam Dei, quod scilicet reprobi justo Dei judicio reprobi manent . . . Si quis igitur objiciat, Si ex parte hominis nihil fit, quod ad electionem attinet, quod concurrat cum divino opere, videtur Deus injustus esse, quòd non omnibus ex æquo idem dat præmium,—Respondendum illi est; Nihil simile esse inter cogitationes Dei et nostras. Nos enim qui legem habemus bene faciendi, hanc quidem legem sequi debemus, nisi injusti esse velimus. At Deus nulla hujusmodi lege tenetur, nullo cogitur præcepto, ut perditis benefaciat, et immeritis conferat salutem," &c. &c. (Ib.)

† See Hist. Vera de Vita, &c., Buceri, &c., 1562. 8vo. fol. 58 and 65. Inserted also in Buceri Scripta Anglic.

"I have sometimes heard a Papist burst out into this rage against M. Bucer, being pressed with his authority: but you are the first professor of the Gospel that ever I heard so churlishly to use *so reverent, so learned, so painful, so* SOUND *a father*, being also an earnest and zealous professor."*

And in the same work he frequently refers, with great respect, to Bucer's Review of the Prayer Book.

Similar invitations were also sent to many other of the more famous divines of the "Reformed"† Churches, and accepted by some of them. Several invitations were also sent to Melancthon, but for some reason not accepted. And here again I must notice the remarkable partiality displayed by Archbishop Laurence in his Bampton Lectures. From a perusal of these Lectures one might suppose that Melancthon was the only one of the foreign Reformers invited to this country by Cranmer, and the invitations addressed to *him* are very carefully recorded;‡ while the fact is, that, with this single exception, (and that in favor of one remarkable for the moderation of his views as a Lutheran, and their leaning towards those of the Reformed party) almost all, if not all, who were invited to this country by Cranmer, to aid him in the work of Reformation, were of the Reformed Churches, and therefore of Zuinglian or Calvinistic views. And now let us see what is the account given by *Archbishop Parker* of those who came over, and compare it with Archbishop Laurence's.

"Archbishop Cranmer, *that he might strengthen the evangelical doctrine* in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, from which an infinite number of teachers go forth for the instruction of the whole kingdom, called into England the *most celebrated divines* from foreign nations, *Peter Martyr Vermilius*, a Florentine, and *Martin Bucer*, a German, from Strasburg. The former taught at Oxford, the latter at Cambridge. With the latter, also, Paul Fagius became Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. And, besides these, Immanuel Tremellius, Bernardine Ochine, Peter Alexander, Valerandus Pollanus,

* Def. of Answer to Admon. p. 522.

† I use the word "Reformed" in its strict sense as distinguished from "Lutheran;" the former following the views of Zuingle or Calvin. It is unnecessary here to enter into the question of any minor differences of view between these two Reformers.

‡ See Bampt. Lect. Note, p. 198.

all of whom, with their children and wives, he liberally maintained. Philip Melancthon also, and Musculus, were invited; but, being kept back by their countrymen, they sent letters to excuse themselves. . . . These three were liberally maintained at the expense of Cranmer. But Fagius soon died. The other two, by constant readings, sermons, and disputations, refuted Popery and *spread the Gospel*; and Bucer died the third year of his coming into England, and his funeral was honoured by the attendance of all orders at Cambridge, and the lamentations of every one expressed in odes and sermons. Peter Martyr still lived and sustained constant labours in the defence of *the evangelical truth* against the Papists."*

What a contrast is this account to that given by Archbishop Laurence! *All the parties here mentioned, except Melancthon, and perhaps Peter Alexander, were of the "Reformed" school.* Of Peter Alexander, it is said by Strype,—

"Peter Alexander was of Artois, and lived with the Archbishop before Bucer came into England. He was a learned man, but had different sentiments in the matter of the Eucharist, inclining to the belief of a corporeal presence with the Lutherans; though some years after he *came over to a righter judgment*, as his companion Peter Martyr signified to Calvin, in a letter wrote from Strasburg." (Life of Cranmer, 195, or Oxf. ed. 279.)

So that the effect of Peter Alexander's residence in England was to attach him completely to the "Reformed" party.

To the persons just mentioned as having come over to this country on the invitation of Cranmer, I must add John a Lasco, a well-known divine of the "*Reformed*" school. Cranmer's first invitation not having been successful, he thus addressed him in a second letter, dated July 4, 1548.

"I am sorry that your coming to us has been prevented by the unlooked for intervention of some other engagement. . . . We are desirous of setting forth in our churches *the true doctrine of God*, and have no wish to be shifting and unstable, or to deal in ambiguities; but, laying aside all carnal considerations, to transmit to posterity a true and explicit form of doctrine agreeable to the rule of the sacred writings: so that there may not only be set forth among all nations an illustrious testimony respecting our doctrine, delivered by the grave authority of learned and godly men, but that all posterity

* Translated from Antiq. Britann. p. 508; ed. 1729, fol.

may have a pattern to imitate. For the purpose of carrying this important design into execution, we have thought it necessary to have the assistance of learned men, who, having compared their opinions together with us, may do away with doctrinal controversies, and build up an entire system of true doctrine. *We have therefore invited both yourself and some other learned men;* and as they have come over to us without any reluctance, so that we scarcely have to regret the absence of any of them, with the exception of yourself and Melancthon, we *earnestly request you,* both to come yourself, and, if possible, to bring Melancthon with you." (Cranmer's Works, P. S. ed. vol. ii. pp. 421, 422, where the original Latin is also given.)

It would appear, then, from this letter, that Melancthon was the only Lutheran that had been *invited* by Cranmer to come over to this country.

It is also of importance to notice the parties invited to this country by Cranmer, to aid him in the project he had much at heart of drawing up a Confession of Faith which might be accepted by all the Protestant Churches. The three persons to whom he wrote on this subject were Melancthon, *Henry Bullinger, and Calvin.** His object was thus expressed in his letter to Calvin,—

"I have often wished, and still continue to do so, that learned and godly men, who are eminent for erudition and judgment, might meet together in some place of safety, where, by taking counsel together, and comparing their respective opinions, they might handle *all the heads of ecclesiastical doctrine,* and hand down to posterity, under the weight of their authority, some work not only upon the subjects themselves, but upon the forms of expressing them."†

The letters to Bullinger and Calvin are dated March 20, 1552. That to Melancthon on this subject is dated March 27, 1552, and in it the Archbishop says,—

"I have written likewise to Masters Calvin and Bullinger, and exhorted them not to be wanting to a work so necessary, and so useful to the commonwealth of Christendom. You wrote me word in your last letter that the Areopagites of the Council of Trent are making decrees respecting the worship of the host. Wherefore since the adversaries of the Gospel meet together with so much zeal for

* See the Letters to them in his Works, Vol. II. pp. 430—434.
† Ib. p. 432.

the establishment of error, we must not allow them to be more diligent in confirming ungodliness, than we are in propagating and setting forth the doctrine of godliness."*

The project (it is unnecessary to add) failed, the difficulties attending its fulfilment being no doubt insuperable, but the names of the parties applied to by Cranmer show the bias of his mind. And it is impossible not to see from the facts just mentioned, how completely certain parties among us are self-condemned, when in one and the same breath they maintain the agreement of their views with those of Cranmer, and at the same time depreciate and despise the very men, Peter Martyr, Bucer, &c., whom he called over to this country, and placed in situations of the greatest importance, to teach the nation what he believed to be the true faith.

Further; what was the doctrine of Thomas Becon, one of Cranmer's chaplains,† and appointed by him one of the six preachers at Canterbury;‡ appointments which are surely good tests of Cranmer's judgment as to the soundness of his doctrine?

In his "Pomander of Prayer," published as early as 1532, we find a prayer afterwards transferred to Edward the Sixth's Primer, (where it appeared under the sanction of the highest authorities of the Church,) from which the following is an extract.

"Notwithstanding, O heavenly Father, thou hast a little flock, to whom it is thy pleasure to give the glorious kingdom of heaven. There is a certain number of sheep that hear thy voice, whom no man is able to pluck out of thy hand, which shall never perish, to whom also thou shalt give eternal life. Make me therefore, O Lord, of that number whom thou from everlasting hast predestinate to be saved, whose names also are written in the book of life."§

"This Calvinistical devotional tract [observes Lowndes] was, says Gifford, a frequent subject of ridicule with the wits of those days."¶ But the author of this "*Calvinistical* devotional tract" was made by Cranmer one of his chaplains, and one of the six

* Ib. p. 434.
† Strype's Cranmer, book 2, c. 33, p. 290, or 417.
‡ Ib. book 3, c. 28, p. 423, or 607.
§ Works, P. S. ed. Vol. iii. p. 84.
¶ Lowndes's Bibliotheca, under "Becon."

preachers at Canterbury; and the very prayer which is the most thoroughly Calvinistical of all, was inserted, or allowed to be inserted, by Cranmer, in the Primer issued by royal authority for public use.

The same sentiments will be found in his "Christmas Banquet," first published in 1542.*

In his Catechism (of the date of which I am uncertain) he says,—

"If the election of God be certain, as it is most certain, who learneth not then of these aforesaid sentences, that God's elect can by no means perish? To be elected is to be saved. . . . Our whole salvation dependeth not of any external work, but of the free election and undoubted grace of God."†

So in his "Sick Man's Salve," written in the form of a dialogue, in the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, we find the following;—

"*Epaphrod.* What if I be not of the number of those whom God hath predestinate to be saved?—*Philem.* Fear you not. God, without all doubt, hath sealed you by his Holy Spirit unto everlasting life. Your name is written in the book of life. You are a citizen of that new, glorious, and heavenly Jerusalem. You shall remain with God in glory, after your departure, for ever and ever.—*Epaph.* It sore repenteth me that I have at any time offended the Lord my God.—*Phil.* This repentance is an evident testimony of your salvation, and that God hath predestinate and tofore appointed you unto everlasting life. . . . *Epaph.* I have an earnest faith in the blood of Christ, that God the Father will forgive me all my sins for Christ's sake.—*Phil.* You thus believing cannot perish; but this your faith is an undoubted assurance unto your conscience that you are predestinate to be saved. For it is written," &c.

And so the dialogue proceeds, treating baptism, the reception with comfort of the Lord's Supper, the glad hearing of the word of God, as so many evidences that God hath "chosen" such a person "to be his," and "predestinated him unto everlasting glory."‡

So in his "Common Places of the Holy Scripture," published in 1562, three heads of his Common Places are the following;—

* See his Works, P. S. ed. Vol. i. p. 72.
† Works, Vol. ii. p. 222. ‡ Works, Vol. iii. pp. 172, 173.

"That God's election is certain and unchangeable."
"That God's election is free and undeserved."
"That God's elect and chosen cannot perish."*

And the same doctrine is repeated in his "Demands of Holy Scripture," published in 1563.†

Another remarkable testimony as to the system of doctrine embraced by the great body of our divines at this period, occurs in two letters of Dean Traheron to Bullinger. The first is dated Sept. 10, 1552, and in it he writes thus.—

"I am exceedingly desirous to know what you and the other very learned men who live at Zurich, think respecting the predestination and providence of God. If you ask the reason, there are certain individuals here who lived among you some time, and who assert that you lean too much to Melancthon's views. *But* THE GREATER NUMBER AMONG US, *of whom I own myself to be one, embrace the opinion of John Calvin,* as being perspicuous and most agreeable to Holy Scripture. And we truly thank God, that that excellent treatise of the very learned and excellent John Calvin, against Pighius and one Georgius Siculus, should have come forth at the very time when the question began to be agitated among us. For we confess that he has thrown much light upon the subject, or rather so handled it, as that we have never before seen any thing more learned or more plain. We are anxious, however, to know what are your opinions, to which we justly allow much weight. We certainly hope that you differ in no respect from his excellent and most learned opinion. At least you will please to point out what you approve in that treatise, or think defective, or reject altogether, if indeed you do reject any part of it, *which we shall not easily believe.*" (Orig. Lett. vol. i. pp. 325, 326.)

And from the reply of Traheron (dated June 3, 1553) to Bullinger's answer, it appears that the point of disagreement was, respecting an extreme statement of Calvin as to God's predetermination of the evil actions of men.

"Though I admire," says Traheron, "both your exceeding learning and moderation in this writing of yours, nevertheless, to say the truth, I cannot altogether think as you do. . . . . Though God does not himself create in us evil desires, which are born with us, we

* Ib. pp. 316, 318. † Ib. p. 616.

maintain nevertheless, that he determines the place, the time, and mode [of bringing them into action], so that nothing can happen otherwise than as he has before determined that it should happen. For, as Augustine has it, he ordains even darkness. To be brief, we ascribe all actions to God, but leave to men whatever sin there is in them. . . . . You do not approve of Calvin, when he states that God not only foresaw the fall of the first man, and in him the ruin of his posterity, but that he also at his own pleasure arranged it. And unless we allow this, we shall certainly take away both the providence and the wisdom of God altogether." (Ib. pp. 326, 327.)

The remark of Bullinger, to which the last sentence refers, was this:

"Ego certe sic loqui non ausim, utpote qui existimem gratiæ sinceritatem defendi posse, utcunque non dicamus Deum homines creare in exitium, et in illum finem ipsos deducere aut impellere indurando et excæcando." (Ib. 327.)

Now the reader will observe, that Traheron states, that the views he here defends, which involve the extreme of Calvinism, were the views of "*the greater number*" of his brethren. And at the time that he wrote the first letter, he was Dean of Chichester, to which Deanery he was appointed in Sept. 1551;* and between writing the two letters, i. e. in January 1552 (O. S.)† he was promoted to a prebendal stall at Windsor. The prevalence, therefore, of the very *highest* Calvinistical views among a large portion of our clergy at that period can hardly, in the face of such testimony, be denied; while I doubt not, that the more moderate and judicious views of Bullinger upon the point here in question, prevailed with such men as Cranmer and Ridley, and others. But this passage may show us, how widely even still higher views than those of Bullinger prevailed here at that time.

A still more weighty testimony may be derived from certain public documents of this period.

In the same year (1553) in which the Articles of Edward VI. (agreed upon in 1552) were first published, there was "set forth, by the King's Majesty's authority for all schoolmasters to teach," "a Short Catechism" in Latin and English; to which

* Strype's Eccl. Memor. II. ii. 266. † Ib. 276.

the Articles were adjoined. This Catechism, Bishop Ridley tells us,* was *subscribed both by himself and Cranmer*, as well as others. In this public document, therefore, we have the best possible witness of their tenets at that time. I must beg the attention of the reader, then, to the following extract from that part of it that relates to "the Church."

"To the furnishing of this commonwealth [i. e. the Church], belong all they, as many as do truly fear, honour, and call upon God, wholly applying their mind to holy and godly living; and all those that, putting all their hope and trust in him, do assuredly look for the bliss of everlasting life. But *as many as are in this faith stedfast, were forechosen, predestinate, and appointed out to everlasting life, before the world was made.* Witness hereof they have within in their hearts the Spirit of Christ, the author, earnest, and unfailable pledge of their faith. Which faith only is able to perceive the mysteries of God: only bringeth peace unto the heart: only taketh hold on the righteousness that is in Christ Jesus.

"*Master.* Doth then the Spirit alone and faith (sleep we never so soundly, or stand we never so reckless and slothful) so work all things for us, as without any help of our own to carry us idle up to heaven?

"*Scholar.* I use, Master, as you have taught me, to make a difference between the *cause* and the *effects.* The first, principal, and most perfect cause of our justifying and salvation, is *the goodness and love of God: whereby he chose us for his before he made the world.* After that, God granteth us to be called by the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, when the Spirit of the Lord is poured into us by whose guiding and governance we be led to settle our trust in God: and hope for the performance of all his promises. With this choice is joined, as companion, the mortifying of the old man, that is, of our affection and lust. From the same Spirit also cometh our sanctification: the love of God, and of our neighbour: justice: and uprightness of life: finally, to say all in sum, *whatsoever is in us, or may be done of us, pure, honest, true, and good, that altogether springeth out of this most pleasant root, from this most plentiful fountain, the goodness, love, choice, and unchangeable purpose of God. He is the cause, the rest are the fruits and effects.* Yet are also the goodness, choice, and Spirit of God, and Christ himself, causes conjoined and coupled each with other: which may be reckoned among the principal causes of our salvation. As oft

* Disp. at Oxford. See his Works, p. 227.

therefore as we use to say, that we are made righteous and saved by only faith; it is meant thereby, that faith, or rather trust alone, doth lay hand upon, understand and perceive, our righteous-making to be given us of God freely; that is to say, by no deserts of our own, but by the free grace of the Almighty Father. Moreover faith doth engender in us the love of our neighbour, and such works as God is pleased withal. For if it be a lively and true faith, quickened by the Holy Ghost, she is the mother of all good saying and doing. By this short tale it is evident, whence and by what means we attain to be made righteous. For *not by the worthiness of our deservings were we heretofore chosen, or long ago saved: but by the only mercy of God, and pure grace of Christ our Lord, whereby we were in him made to those good works that God hath appointed for us to walk in.* And although good works cannot deserve to make us righteous before God, yet do they so cleave unto faith, that neither can faith be found without them, nor good works be anywhere without faith . . . .

"*Master.* Why is he [the Holy Ghost] called holy?

"*Scholar.* Not only for his own holiness, but for that by him are *made holy the chosen of God, and members of Christ.*"*

Can it be denied, that this is what would now be called clear and decided Calvinism?

But further. In the same year was published, "A Primer, or Book of Private Prayer," "authorized and set forth by the King's Majesty, to be taught, learned, read, and used by all his loving subjects," of course by the counsel of Cranmer, Ridley, and others, like the Articles and Catechism. Now in one of the prayers of this book, in which they would surely be cautious of introducing such a doctrine without strongly feeling its importance, we have the Prayer (*verbatim*) which I have given above (p. 65) from one of Becon's works.†

There is also one more document of a similar kind, prepared under the guidance and direction of Archbishop Cranmer, about the same time as those already quoted; the publication of which however, at the time of its preparation, was prevented by the death of Edward VI. I mean the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum," which, as is well known, received its last correc-

* Two Liturgies, with other Documents, of Edw. VI. Parker. Soc. ed. pp. 511–514.

† Liturgies and Documents of Edw. VI. p. 475.

tions from Cranmer. In this book there is an article "On Predestination," in which, after reproving those who indulge themselves in sin, saying that as they are either predestinated to life or not, it matters not, the writer proceeds,—

"But we, taught by the Holy Scriptures, lay down this doctrine in this matter, that an earnest and correct contemplation of our predestination and election (respecting which it was appointed by the will of God before the foundations of the world were laid),—such an earnest and serious contemplation as we have mentioned of these things soothes the minds of pious men inspired with the Spirit of Christ, and beginning to experience a subjection of the flesh and members, and looking upwards to heavenly things with a certain most sweet and pleasant consolation; since it confirms our faith of eternal salvation being about to come to us through Christ, lights up the most earnest flames of love towards God, wonderfully excites to thanksgivings, leads us as near as possible to good works, and draws us away as far as possible from sins; since we are elected by God and appointed his sons; which peculiar and excellent condition demands of us purity of morals and the highest perfection of virtue, and moreover lessens our arrogance, that we should not believe that the things which are freely given us by the gratuitous benevolence and infinite goodness of God are the produce of our own strength. Moreover, we hold that no one can derive from this doctrine an excuse for his faults, because God has ordained nothing in any matter unjustly, nor ever forces our wills unwillingly to sin. Wherefore all are to be warned by us that in undertaking any actions they must not betake themselves to the decrees of prædestination, but order their whole course of life agreeably to the laws of God, since they see both promises to the good and threats to the evil proposed generally in the Holy Scriptures. For we ought to enter upon the worship of God in those ways, and abide in that will of God which we see to be set forth in the Holy Scriptures."*

* Nos vero sacris Scripturis eruditi, talem in hac re doctrinam ponimus, quod diligens et accurata cogitatio de prædestinatione nostra et electione suscepta (de quibus Dei voluntate determinatum fuit, antequam mundi fundamenta jacerentur)—Hæc itaque diligens et seria, quam diximus, his de rebus cogitatio, piorum hominum animos, spiritu Christi afflatos et carnis ac membrorum subjectionem persentiscentes [for 'persentiscentes' the printed editions have, by mistake, 'præsentes'], et ad cœlestia sursum tendentes, dulcissima quadam et jucundissima consolatione permulcet, quoniam fidem nostram de perpetua salute per Christum ad nos perventura confirmat, vehementissimas charitatis in Deum flammas accendit, mirabiliter ad gratias agendas excuscitat, ad bona nos opera propinquissime adducit, et a peccatis longissime abducit, quoniam a Deo sumus electi, et filii ejus

What is the doctrine here maintained cannot, I conceive, admit of any question.

But if there were any doubt on the subject, the names of the authors would be sufficient to remove it; for, as we have seen in a preceding page,* the parties whom Cranmer employed to draw it up were Peter Martyr, whose views on the subject are well known; Dr. Rowland Taylor, who, as we shall see presently, joined with John Bradford, in a letter to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, asking their names to a treatise of Bradford upholding the doctrine of free election; and Walter Haddon, whose sentiments are abundantly manifested in his answer to Osorius.† If the Article needed interpretation, then, we have here a clear proof of the doctrine intended to be conveyed by it, as well as of Cranmer's state of mind when he employed such men to draw it up.

I pass on to the testimony of Bradford, and his controversy with some of his fellow-prisoners, in the time of Queen Mary, on this subject. In the year 1554, when all Protestants of any note, whatever their peculiar sentiments might be, were in prison, Strype tells us,—

"One thing there now fell out, which caused some disturbance among the prisoners. Many of them that were under restraint for the profession of the Gospel were such as held free will, tending to

instituti, quæ singularis et eximia conditio summam a nobis salubritatem morum et excellentissimam virtutis perfectionem requirit, denique nobis arrogantiam minuit, ne viribus nostris geri credamus, quæ gratuita Dei beneficentia et infinita bonitate indulgentur. Præterea neminem ex hoc loco purgationem censemus vitiorum suorum afferre posse, quia Deus nihil ulla in re injuste constituit, nec ad peccata voluntates nostras unquam invitas tradit. Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi sunt ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta prædestinationis se non referant, sed universam vitæ suæ rationem ad Dei leges accommodent, cum et promissiones bonis et minas malis in sacris Scripturis generaliter propositas contemplentur. Debemus enim ad Dei cultum viis illis ingredi, et in illa Dei voluntate commorari, quam in sacris Scripturis patefactam esse videmus. (MS. Bibl. Harl. No. 426, fol. 15, 16, in the British Museum. The work from which this is extracted was published in 1571; edited by John Fox; and again in 1640. But the above extract is given from the MS. of the work, belonging to Cranmer, and interlined and corrected by him, among the Harleian MSS. In the last sentence but one the words originally were, "et cum promissiones tum minas in sacris Scripturis sibi propositas contemplentur," which were altered by Cranmer to those given above.)

* See p. 57 above.

† Respons. contra. Osor. 1577, lib. 2. An English translation of it was published, from which large extracts are given in Richmond's English Fathers, vol. 8.

the derogation of God's grace, and refused *the doctrine of absolute predestination* and original sin. . . . Bradford had much discourse with them. . . . Bradford was apprehensive that they might now do great harm in the Church, and therefore out of prison wrote a letter to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, the three chief heads of the Reformed (though oppressed) Church in England, to take some cognizance of this matter, and to consult with them in remedying it. And with him joined Bishop Ferrar, Rowland Taylor, and [Archdeacon] John Philpot. . . . Upon this occasion Ridley wrote a treatise of God's election and predestination. And *Bradford wrote another upon the same subject, and sent it to those three fathers in Oxford, for their approbation*, and, theirs being obtained, the rest of the eminent divines in and about London were ready to sign it also.*

Now Ridley's Treatise is unfortunately lost. But Bradford's we have. And what is its testimony?

"This is a sum; that, where a Christian man's life hath respect to God, to man, and to himself, to live godly, justly, and soberly, all is grounded in predestination in Christ. For who liveth godly but he that believeth? And who believeth, but such as are ordained to eternal life? Who liveth justly, but such as love their neighbours? And whence springeth this love, but of God's election before the beginning of the world, that we might be blameless by love? Who liveth soberly but such as be holy? and who are those, but only they that be endued with the spirit of sanctification, which is the seal of our election which (by election) do believe?" "This word of God, which is written in the canonical books of the Bible, doth plainly set forth unto us, that God hath, of his own mercy and good will, and to the praise of his grace and glory in Christ, elected some, and not all, whom he hath predestinated unto everlasting life in the same Christ, and in his time calleth them, justifieth them, and glorifieth them, so that they shall never perish and err to damnation finally." "That the cause of God's election is of his good will, the Apostle sheweth," &c. "That election is so certain, that the elect and predestinate to eternal life shall never perish or err to damnation finally, the Apostle doth here also very plainly shew," &c.†

This Treatise was sent, with the Letter above-mentioned,

---

* Strype's Cranmer, p. 350, (502, Oxf. ed.)

† Letters of the Martyrs, ed. 1837, pp. 302—305. This treatise, with a second part, containing much additional matter, was published by Archbishop Laurence in his "Authentic Documents of the Predestinarian Controversy," Oxf. 1819, 8vo., a publication which I shall notice presently. It has since been printed, from the MS., more correctly, in Mr. Townsend's excellent edition of Bradford's Works, published by the Parker Society.

signed by Bishop Ferrar, Rowland Taylor, and Archdeacon Philpot, to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, for their approval. We have, unfortunately, no evidence to show what their judgment on this Treatise was. But is it to be credited, that if its *general* doctrine was not agreeable to their views on the subject, *which must have been well known,* one who was so well acquainted with their sentiments as Bradford would have sent the Treatise to them for their approval; to say nothing of the consent of Ferrar, Taylor, and Philpot? A reply to Bradford's Letter, however, from Bishop Ridley, is extant, and therefore I will here insert the more important parts of Bradford's Letter and Ridley's reply.

"Herewithal I send unto you a little treatise, which I have made, that you might peruse the same; and not only you, but also ye, my other most dear and reverend Fathers in the Lord for ever, to give your approbation, as ye may think good. All the prisoners hereabout in manner have seen it and read it; and as therein they agree with me, nay rather with the truth, so they are ready and will be to signify it, as they shall see you give them example. The matter may be thought not so necessary as I seem to make it. But yet if ye knew the great evil that is like hereafter to come to the posterity by these men, as partly this bringer [Augustin Berneher] can signify unto you, surely then could ye not but be most willing to put hereto your helping hands. The which thing that I might the more occasion you to perceive, I have sent you here a writing of Harry Hart's own hand.... In free-will they are plain Papists, *yea, Pelagians.* And ye know that modicum fermenti totam massam corrumpit. They utterly contemn all learning. But hereof shall this bringer show you more. As to the chief captains, therefore, of Christ's Church here, I complain of it unto you; as truly I must do of you unto God in the last day, if ye will not, as ye can, help something, ut veritas doctrinæ maneat apud posteros, in this behalf; as ye have done in behalf of matters expunged by the Papists."*

To this letter of Bradford, expressly accusing the doctrine opposed to that of his treatise, of Pelagianism, Ridley replies in one in which he evidently *sympathizes with him fully in the controversies he had had to sustain with his fellow-prisoners,* drawing no distinction on this point of predestination, which, had he

* Letters of the Martyrs, ed. 1837, p. 274, 275.

disagreed with Bradford on the point, he would have been bound to do; and in the beginning of this letter refers particularly (among others) to those "infected with the errors of the Pelagians," which, unless he had agreed with Bradford in the justice of the accusation, he would not have done. His words are these.

"Whereas you write of the outrageous rule that Satan, our ghostly enemy, beareth abroad in the world, whereby he stirreth and raiseth so pestilent and heinous heresies, as some to deny the blessed Trinity, some the divinity of our Saviour Christ, some the divinity of the Holy Ghost, some the baptism of infants, some original sin, and *to be infected with the errors of the Pelagians*, and to re-baptize those that have been baptized with Christ's baptism already; alas! Sir, this doth declare this time and these days to be wicked indeed!"... "As for other the devil's galtropes that he casteth in our ways by some of his busy-headed younkers, I trust they shall never be able to do the multitude so great harm. For blessed be God, these heresies before time, when Satan by his servants hath been about to broach them, have by God's servants already been so sharply and truly confounded, that the multitude was never infected with them, or else where they have been infected, they are healed again, that now the peril is not so great. And where you say, that if your request had been heard, things (you think) had been in better case than they be; know you that concerning the matter you mean, I have in Latin drawn out the places of the Scriptures, and upon the same have noted what I can for the time. Sir, in those matters I am so fearful, that I dare not speak farther, yea, almost none otherwise than the very text doth, as it were, lead me by the hand. And where you exhort us to help, &c. O Lord, what is else in this world that we now should list to do? I bless my Lord God, I never (as methinketh) had more, nor better leisure to be occupied with my pen in such things as I can do, to set forth (when they may come to light) God's glory."*

Bishop Coverdale, who first published this letter in his "Letters of the Martyrs," observes, in the margin, on the latter part of this extract, "He meaneth here the matter of God's election, whereof he afterward wrote *a godly and comfortable treatise remaining yet in the hands of some*, and hereafter shall come to light, if God so willed;"—an observation

* Letters of the Martyrs, ed. 1837, pp. 46, 47.

which of itself leads to the conclusion that Ridley took in the main the same ground as Bradford on this subject, for there can be little doubt that Miles Coverdale would not otherwise have called it "a godly and comfortable treatise." In fact, however much the letter may show Ridley's caution in his statements on the subject, one thing is clear, that he sympathised with Bradford in at least his general views, and was not inclined to find fault with his treatise, but that he preferred drawing up a statement of his own upon the matter.

Indeed, when we consider in what light Ridley regarded and acted towards Bradford and those that agreed with him in doctrine, and at the same time the strong feeling that existed on both sides on the subjects in controversy, we can have no reasonable doubt as to Ridley's views. On Nov. 18, 1552, he thus writes to Sir W. Cecil, Secretary to Edw. VI., and Sir J. Gate, his Vice-Chamberlain. "Ye know both how I did bestow of late three or four prebends, which did fall in my time, and what manner of men they be unto whom I gave them, *Grindall, Bradford, and Rogers,* men known to be so necessary to be abroad in the commonwealth, that I can keep none of them with me in the house." And then noticing the report that Grindall was about to be made a Bishop, he asks to be allowed to fill up his place in these terms,—

"If ye would know, unto whom I would this dignity of our Church, called the Chantership, should be given, surely unto any one of these, either unto Mr. Bradford, *whom in my conscience I judge more worthy to be a Bishop than many* [*a one*] *of us that be Bishops already to be a parish priest;* or unto Mr. Sampson, a preacher; or unto Mr. Harvey, a divine and preacher; or unto Mr. Grimbold, a preacher; or unto Dr. Lancelot Ridley, a preacher." (Works, pp. 336, 337.)

The views of all the parties here mentioned, are well known as having been agreeable to Bradford's, except two, Harvey and Grimbold, who, if I recollect rightly, have not left any thing from which their views can be ascertained. Is it possible, however, to suppose, that if Ridley's doctrinal views differed from Bradford's in such important points as those we are now considering, Ridley would have borne such a testimony to him as he here does?

So again, writing to him when both were in prison, he says,—

"Blessed be God that hath given you liberty in the mean season, that you may use your pen to his glory, and to the comfort (as I hear say) of many." (Ib. p. 364.)

"If it be not the place that sanctifieth the man, but the holy man doth by Christ sanctify the place, brother Bradford, then happy and holy shall be that place wherein thou shalt suffer, and shall be with thy ashes in Christ's cause sprinkled over withal. All thy country may rejoice of thee, that ever it brought forth such a one. . . . O good brother, blessed be God in thee, and *blessed be the time that ever I knew thee.*" (Ib. p. 378.)

And writing of Bradford to Augustine Bernecher, he says,—

"I do not doubt but that he for those gifts of grace which the Lord hath bestowed on him plenteously, hath holpen those who are gone before in their journey, that is, hath animated them and encouraged them to keep the highway, et sic currere uti tandem acciperent premium. The Lord be his comfort, whereof I do not doubt, and thank God heartily that ever I was acquainted with him, and that ever I had such a one in my house." (Ib. p. 380.)

These subsidiary testimonies as to Ridley's views are surely sufficient to show to which *school* of doctrine he belonged. And who are the parties to whom Bradford, Bishop Ferrar, Dr. Rowland Taylor, and Archdeacon Philpot were opposed in this matter? Their very names show the insignificance of the party at that time. "Their *chief man*," says Strype, "was Harry Hart; who had written something in defence of his doctrine. Trewe and Abingdon were teachers also among them; Kemp, Gibson, and Chamberlain were others." (Cranmer, 350.) And to Trewe's "Narrative of the Contention," pointing out the "enormities" of Bradford's doctrine (answered by Bradford in the treatise above referred to), the following are the names subscribed. "John Trewe, Thomas Avington, Richard Harman, John Jacksonne, Henry Wickham, Cornelius Stevenson, John Guelle, Thomas Arede, John Saxbye, Robert Hitcherst, Matthew Hitcherst, Margery Russell."* Will any one afford us further information as to these parties?

---

* Authentic Documents relative to the Predestinarian Controversy, with Introduction by R. Laurence (afterwards Archbishop of Cashel.) Oxf. 1819. 8vo. pp. 69, 70. I have noticed this case somewhat fully, on ac-

The last testimony which I shall produce, is that of Archdeacon Philpot. His agreement with Bradford has already appeared by the letter which they unitedly addressed to Ridley, enclosing a copy of Bradford's treatise on Predestination for his

---

count of the attempt made in the above work to represent Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, as unwilling to sanction Bradford's views in the above-mentioned Treatise, and to raise the opposing party, headed by Hart and Trewe, into some importance. It would occupy too much space here to reply to the arguments adduced, which however, to my mind, are weak and far-fetched in the extreme. I must leave them to be met by the positive testimonies given above. I will only observe, that it is easy to conceive, that there may have been several reasons to prevent Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley formally setting their hands, under their circumstances, to Bradford's Treatise, besides disapproval of its contents; and that Ridley, neither in the Letter quoted above, nor in that which the Archbishop has cited in addition, hints at disapproval, which he *would of course have done, had he felt it.*

There is a passage, however, in this work which it may be well more particularly to notice. Dr. Laurence says, "The doctrine which seems to have been a principal point of controversy between the Predestinarian and Anti-Predestinarian party, and to have proved most offensive to the latter, was that which is usually called *the indefectibility of grace.*" (p. xl.) Now, if instead of the phrase "the indefectibility of grace," which (though it has certainly often been used by divines) is ambiguous, and likely to mislead, inasmuch as it is very generally granted that every kind of grace is not indefectible, we insert the phrase *the indefectibility of true Christian faith and justification*, Cranmer was clearly, from the passages given above, a supporter of the doctrine. The Archbishop proceeds to contrast some words of Careless and Ridley, spoken shortly before their martyrdom, to illustrate the views of the two parties. The words of Careless are, "I am most sure and certain of my salvation by Jesus, so that my soul is safe already, whatsoever pains my body may suffer." Now certainly this (whatever we may think of it) is only following out the teaching of Cranmer in the passages given above. But the extract which the Archbishop has selected out of all the numerous letters of Ridley, written in prison, is a singular specimen of the way in which a case may be made out. He says,—"Contrast with this the modest but manly expressions of Ridley, when contemplating the same event. . . . 'I know that the Lord's words must be verified in me, that I shall appear before the incorrupt Judge, and be countable to him of all my former life. And although the hope of his mercy is my sheet-anchor of eternal salvation, yet am I persuaded, that whosoever wittingly neglecteth, and regardeth not to clear his conscience, he cannot have peace with God, nor a lively faith in his mercy.' Can we for a moment conceive, that men who expressed themselves so differently upon the same occasion, could have coincided in the same common sentiments?" But the contrast is a most unfair one, because it is not a contrast of similar passages; and there is no inconsistency in the two. The question is, whether these cautious expressions of Ridley, *used in a Letter to a Romanist* (Works, p. 339), with only an *indirect* reference to his feelings in the prospect of martyrdom, really represented the *extent* of his faith. And it needs only a reference to other passages in his Letters at this period to see that this was not the case. Let us mark how he expressed himself in his "Farewell." "All ye," he says, "that be my true

approval. His Remains are almost exclusively occupied with other subjects, but there are a few passages which clearly show his mind on the points in question, and one of them (considering his position and learning) proves much more than his own

---

lovers and friends rejoice, and rejoice with me again....that for his Son's sake....he hath vouchsafed to call me....unto this high dignity of his *true prophets*, of his *faithful apostles*, and of his *holy, elect, and chosen martyrs*." (Works, p. 398.) "Ye that be my kinsfolk and countrymen, know ye....that ye have and shall have, by God's grace, ever cause to rejoice and to thank God highly, and to think good of it, and in God to rejoice of me, your flesh and blood, whom God of his gracious goodness *hath vouchsafed to associate unto the blessed company of his holy martyrs in heaven*." (Ib.) This surely is quite as strong, to say the least, as the language of Careless.

But certainly the Archbishop could never have read the passages I have given above from Cranmer, when he penned the following sentence. "But, indeed," he proceeds, "those [i.e. the sentiments] of Ridley as well as of Cranmer, upon this much controverted topic, are sufficiently, I apprehend, developed in the following words of our Funeral Service: 'Suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to *fall from thee*:' words, which so plainly indicate the possibility of *falling from grace* even in the very hour of death, that the ingenuity neither of ancient nor of modern Calvinists has ever been able to explain them away."* That is, we are to suppose, that Cranmer and Ridley held that the true children of God, the living members of Christ, may apostatize and cease to to be so *through the pains endured in the hour of death*. Such a thought, I believe, our Reformers would have repelled with horror; nor do I think that the words refer to actual apostasy, but to a loss of active trust in God's mercy and promises. And the Archbishop has himself supplied the best answer to his own statement. For (meeting a supposed reply to his arguments) he says,—"The passage in which they [the words in question] are found was taken from a German Hymn of Luther, composed as a kind of poetical paraphrase upon another very ancient one, in the Offices of the Romish Church. The words of Luther in the latter part of this Hymn are....[he gives the German, and himself translates thus] 'O holy Lord God, O holy mighty God, O holy merciful Saviour, thou God eternal, suffer us not *to fall from the consolation of true faith*.' To ascertain, therefore, the precise meaning of the terms in our own Liturgy, nothing more seems requisite than to compare them with the original."† Precisely so; and we find that the fall meant is not final apostasy, but a fall from such a faith as brings *consolation* and peace with it.‡

We must also recollect that the parties alluded to by the Archbishop hold it to be the Christian's duty to seek of God in prayer the aid and blessings he needs, however much he may feel assured that they are his by promise. The use of such prayers, therefore, is no proof that the party using them does not hold the doctrine objected to.

But, to give the last merciful stroke to this sorry argument, the fact is,

---

* Authentic Documents; Introd. p. xli. Also Bampton Lect. 3rd ed. p. 381.

† Bampton Lect. p. 381.

‡ Compare the translation of Heb. xii. 5 and 12, as given by Ridley. (Works, p. 424.)

view, and will be, I think, considered by impartial readers as decisive of the question we are here discussing.

The first I shall quote is from one of his letters, touching upon the subject rather incidentally than directly, and in the form of a caution to those who abused the doctrine.

"Some other," he says, "there be, that for an extreme refuge in their evil doings, do run to God's predestination and election, saying, that if I be elected of God to salvation, I shall be saved, whatsoever I do. But such be great tempters of God, and abominable blasphemers of God's holy election; and cast themselves down from the pinnacle of the temple in presumption, that God may preserve them by his angels through predestination. Such verily may reckon themselves to be none of God's elect children, that will do evil that good may ensue, whose damnation is just, as St. Paul saith. *God's predestination and election ought to be with a simple eye considered,* to make us more warily to walk in good and godly conversation according to God's word, and not to set cock in the hoop, and put all on God's back, to do wickedly at large: for the elect children of God must walk in righteousness and holiness, after that they be once called to true knowledge; for so saith St. Paul to the Ephesians, that God 'hath chosen us before the foundations of the world were laid, that we should be holy and blameless in his sight.' Therefore St. Peter willeth us through good works to make our vocation and election certain *to ourselves,* which *we know not* but by the good working of God's Spirit in us according to the rule of the Gospel; and he that transformeth not himself to the same in godly conversation, may justly tremble and doubt that he is none of the elect children of God, but of the viperous generation, and a child of darkness. For the children of light will walk in the works of light, and not of darkness: though they fall they do not lie still."*

The next passage, however, is more directly to the point. In his fifth examination before Queen Mary's Commissioners, in 1555, occurs the following colloquy,—

---

that the very same expressions were inserted by the Puritans in their Liturgy. In the final prayer of the Baptismal Service, we read,—"We beseech thee, that thou wilt confirm this thy favour more and more towards us, and take this infant into thy tuition and defence, ... and never suffer him *to fall away from thee:* but that he may know thee continually to be his merciful Father, through thine Holy Spirit working in his heart; by whose divine power he *may so prevail against Satan that, in the end, obtaining the victory, he may be exalted into the liberty of thy kingdom.*" (Hall's Reliq. Liturg. Vol. I. p. 50.)

* Philpot's Works, P. S. ed. pp. 223, 224.

"*Philpot.* . . . By this I know *we* are of the truth; for that neither by reasoning, neither by writing, your Synagogue of Rome is able to answer. Where is there one of you all, that ever hath been able to answer any of the godly learned ministers of Germany, who have disclosed your counterfeit religion? *Which of you all at this day is able to answer Calvin's Institutions who is minister of Geneva?*

"Dr. SAVERSON.—*A godly minister indeed of receipt of* cutpurses and runagate traitors! And of late, I can tell you, there is such contention fallen between him and his own sects, that he was fain to flee the town, about predestination. I tell you truth, for I came by Geneva hither.

"*Philpot.*—I am sure you blaspheme that godly man, and that godly church, where he is minister; as it is your church's condition [custom], when you cannot answer men by learning, to oppress them with blasphemies and false reports. *For, in the matter of predestination, he is in none other opinion than all the Doctors of the Church be agreeing to the Scriptures.*"*

This is decisive as to *his own views* at least.

But the passage which I shall now give is still more to the point, as it contains an express testimony as to the views of *our Church* in this matter in King Edward's days. In his last Examination we find the following:—

"*Philpot.* . . . Christ did prophesy that in the latter days there should come false prophets and hypocrites, as you be.—*Coventry.* Your church of Geneva, which ye call the Catholic Church, is that which Christ prophesied of.—*Philpot. I allow the Church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same; for it is* una, Catholica, et apostolica, *and doth follow the doctrine that the apostles did preach;* AND THE DOCTRINE TAUGHT AND PREACHED IN KING EDWARD'S DAYS WAS ALSO ACCORDING TO THE SAME."†

If this is not conclusive upon the question at issue, it is difficult to conceive what would be.

The bearing of these testimonies upon the question of the general tone of doctrine prevailing in our Church in the time of Edward VI., and consequently *on that of the interpretation of our Formularies most suited to the views of our Reformers*, I leave to the judgment of the reader. He will bear in mind that I have no desire to maintain any rigidly *exclusive* view of the doctrine maintained in our Formularies, but that my object is to

* Ib. pp. 45, 46. † Ib. p. 153.

show what was the general tone or character of the doctrine they were intended to *favour*. I believe that they were drawn up so as to admit of some *latitude of interpretation* in the points controverted among the Reformers, and so as *neither to exclude Melancthon nor Calvin;* and consequently that different views were allowed to be inculcated in our Church upon such points; but at the same time I cannot understand, how any impartial reader can doubt, that their bias and intended tendency are towards what is *now* ordinarily *understood* by the phrase "moderate Calvinism," in the important points of Election, Predestination, and Final Perseverance.

Before I pass on, however, I would just add a caution as to the way in which this subject is often dealt with by writers on the other side. To refute their statements at length, would occupy a space which I have not here to give them. But the key to the solution of the difficulties and objections they bring against the view of the subject here maintained, will be found, I think, in the following remarks. The general view of doctrine which prevailed among our early divines is encumbered, in the writings of some of the Reformers, and of those that succeeded them at the latter part of the sixteenth century, with notions and phrases of dangerous and unscriptural character; as, for instance, that Christ died only for the elect, that the predestination of God, and not sin, is the cause of men's condemnation, &c. Against these notions, it is of course not difficult to find passages in the writings of our Reformers. The way, therefore, in which this argument has been conducted has been this:—to connect these notions with the views ordinarily known by the term "the doctrines of free grace," as indissolubly joined in one system with them, and then, by the aid of passages opposed to such statements, to parade the appearance of a host of witnesses against *the whole* system.

And further, inferences drawn from the doctrine objected to, which would be disallowed by those who hold it, are brought forward to prove its opposition to statements of our Formularies or divines.

But such a mode of treating the subject is merely throwing dust into the eyes of the reader. It tends to anything rather than the establishment of truth.

Thus much, then, as to the doctrine of our Church in the time of Edward VI.

I now come to the period of the re-establishment of the Reformation on the accession of Queen Elizabeth. This is a period which, in one view, is of more importance in connexion with our present inquiry than that of Edward VI., inasmuch as the Formularies of our Church were then revised and settled, and have remained ever since nearly in the state in which they were then placed. It is scarcely *necessary*, then, in showing the general view of doctrine they were intended to favour, to go higher than the divines of the Elizabethan period.

To detail all the evidences that might be adduced on the subject with reference to this period, would be a needless labour, when it is so notorious what was the general tone of the doctrine maintained by the great body of the ecclesiastical rulers of our Church at that time. In fact, those who take an opposite view of the matter to that here advocated, are peculiarly shy of this period, and, if they touch it at all, attempt to explain away the difficulties they find, by supposing that communion with the foreign Protestant Churches had caused the exiles, during the reign of Mary, to take a more favourable view of the doctrines of Calvin.

"In prosecuting this inquiry," [*i. e.*, as to the meaning of the 17th Article], says one of them, "it is intended to confine it to the sense of our Reformers in the reign of Edward VI. *To proceed further, into that of Elizabeth, would only be to discover, that many of our divines, during their exile under Queen Mary, were strongly tinctured with Calvin's doctrines.*" (Winchester on Art. 17. pp. 1, 2.)

And so Peter Heylin, hard driven to account for much that took place at this time, says:

"*Many of our divines*, who had fled beyond the sea to avoid the hurry of her [Q. Mary's] reign, though otherwise men of good abilities in most parts of learning, returned so altered in their principles, *as to points of doctrine*, so disaffected to the government forms of worship here by law established, that they seemed not to be the same men at their coming home, as they had been at their going hence: yet such was the necessity which the Church was under, of filling up the vacant places and preferments, which had

been made void either by the voluntary discession or positive deprivation of the Popish clergy, that they were fain to take in all of any condition, which were able to do the public service, without relation to their private opinions in doctrine or discipline, nothing so much regarded in the choice of men for *Bishoprics, Deaneries, Dignities in Cathedral churches, the richest benefices in the country, and places of most command and trust in the Universities*, as their known zeal against the Papists," &c.*

This, no doubt, is a very ingenious mode of accounting for the "Calvinism," as it is called, of that period; but, not to mention other cases, one, already noticed, and that the case of the highest among them, is sufficient to show how little ground there is for the remark. I mean the case of Archbishop Parker, who, in his funeral Sermon for Bucer, especially praises the soundness of his doctrine.

But all this is, in fact, nothing to the point. The question is, what their views were; not, how they imbibed them. And if their views were what are called "Calvinistic," (which is clearly admitted in the above passages) are we to suppose that the Formularies they *voluntarily* established are opposed to those views? Is it credible, is it within the bounds of reason to suppose, that those who had the re-modelling of our Formularies on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, should establish such as they themselves could not honestly subscribe, or even such as did not *favour* their views? The question so completely answers itself, that it would be absurd to propose it, but for the fact, that men, prepossessed by the prejudices of habit and education, and judging from the circumstance that almost the whole of the wealth and power of the National Church have long been in the hands of divines of contrary views, (a change, the origin and progress of which are as distinctly traceable as any event in history), venture to assert that our Formularies are opposed to, and inconsistent with the maintenance of, such doctrines.†

---

* Quinquart. Hist. in his Miscell. Tracts, p. 609.

† I am not, of course, attributing here any deliberate dishonesty to those who maintain a contrary view to that here advocated. There are grounds readily to be found sufficient to account for the difference. The circumstances in which our Reformers found themselves placed, when they had to draw up Formularies for a nation, a large proportion of whom were opposed to their doctrine, and yet were bound by law to worship according to the prescribed National Ritual, necessarily produced an effect upon

I shall select, therefore, a few of the leading testimonies supplied by the Elizabethan period and the earlier part of the reign of James I., in illustration of the subject of this Chapter.

The first testimony to which I shall refer is that of Nowell's Catechism, as being a book known to have had the highest sanction of the ecclesiastical authorities of our Church in the time of Queen Elizabeth, including that of the Convocation. I have already, in a former work,* noticed the fact that a large portion of this Catechism is taken almost *verbatim* from that of Calvin, and I shall therefore place by the side of some of the following extracts the passages in Calvin from which they are taken.

Nowelli Catech.	Calvini Catech.
A. . . . Qui autem sunt in hac fide firmi, stabiles, atque constantes,	

their labours. They retained all which it was possible to retain of the old Ritual, where the words could be interpreted in what they considered an orthodox sense, though bearing with the Romanists another sense. We have a clear illustration of this in the Consecration and Ordination Services, where (as I have shown in my "Vindication of the Defence of the XXXIX Articles") we have the same language continued as that which had long been used by the Romanists, but continued (as one of our earliest and ablest primates, Archbishop Whitgift, tells us) in a very different sense from that which they attributed to it. And this shows the fallaciousness of the rule laid down by Mr. Maskell in his recent "Sermon on the Means of Grace," namely, that all such passages are to be interpreted according to the sense they bore previous to the Reformation, unless there be some definite statement prohibiting this sense in our Formularies. Whereas it is surely obvious, that such passages ought to be interpreted in a sense agreeable to the general system of doctrine maintained by our Reformers. These passages, then, are naturally enough singled out as the stronghold of the Romanizing party among us; their Romish interpretation maintained as the only admissible one; and views attributed to our Reformers utterly abhorrent from their system of doctrine. And to the popular mind, and to those prejudiced in favour of such views, there is of course a plausibility in such statements.

Further, as to the doctrines more immediately in question in this Chapter, there are many expressions in our Formularies which bear different senses, just according to the theological system of the party who interprets them. This is the unavoidable result of the imperfection of human language. The "High Church" school of divines, therefore, naturally enough attaching to them their own sense, make them the test of the doctrinal system of the Reformers, and reduce other passages to the standard of these, so interpreted. But this is surely inverting the right order of proceeding in such a case. It is only by first ascertaining the general system of doctrine maintained by our Reformers, that we are in a condition to pass a correct judgment upon the meaning of many portions of the Formularies they have left us.

* Vindication of the "Defence of the XXXIX Articles," p. 17.

hi electi atque designati et (ut nos loquimur) prædestinati erant AD *hanc tantam felicitatem* ante posita mundi fundamenta: cujus rei testem ipsi intus in animis habent Spiritum Christi, fiduciæ hujus authorem pariter et pignus certissimum. Cujus Divini Spiritus instinctu, *mihi etiam certissime persuadeo meipsum quoque* beata hac civitate, Dei per Christum beneficio, gratuito donatum esse. (Ed. Oxon. 1795. 8vo. p. 96.)

A. Ecclesia est corpus Reipub. Christianæ, id est, universitas *societasque fidelium omnium, quos Deus* per Christum *ad vitam perpetuam* ab æterno tempore *destinavit.* (p. 97.)

P. [Ecclesia est] corpus ac *societas fidelium quos Deus ad vitam æternam prædestinavit.*

M. Ecclesiam hanc cur sanctam appellas?

A. Ut hac notione ab impiorum nefario cœtu discernatur. *Quoscunque enim Deus elegit, in vitæ eos sanctitatem atque innocentiam restituit.* (pp. 97, 98.)

M. Porro Ecclesiam quo sensu nominas sanctam?

P. Quia scilicet *quoscunque elegit Deus,* eos justificat, *reformatque in sanctitatem ac vitæ innocentiam,* &c.

M. *Potestne Ecclesia aliter cognosci, quam quum fide creditur?*

A. *Hic quidem in symbolo proprie agitur de eorum congregatione, quos Deus arcana electione per Christum sibi adoptavit; quæ Ecclesia nec oculis cerni, neque ex signis cognosci perpetuo potest. Est tamen et visibilis seu spectabilis Dei Ecclesia, cujus nobis indicia notasque ostendit atque patefacit.** (pp. 101, 102.)

M. *Potestne autem hæc Ecclesia aliter cognosci quam quum fide creditur?*

P. *Est quidem et visibilis Dei Ecclesia, quam nobis certis indiciis notisque descripsit: sed hic proprie de eorum congregatione agitur, quos arcana sua electione adoptavit in salutem. Ea autem nec cernitur perpetuo oculis, nec signis dignoscitur.*

M. An non omnes ergo in hac visibili ecclesia sunt ex electorum ad vitam æternam numero?

A. Multi per hypocrisin, et simulationem pietatis, in hanc se societatem adjungunt, qui *nihil minus quam vera ecclesiæ membra sunt.* Verum, quia ubicunque verbum Dei sincere docetur, et Sacramenta rite administrantur, ibi perpetuo sunt aliqui ad salutem per Christum designati, totum illum cœtum ecclesiam esse Dei cense-

* The note of Bishop Cleaver, the editor of the edition from which I quote, upon this passage is,—"Frustra profecto intelligebat Nowellus Symbolum hîc proprie agere de Ecclesia invisibili," &c. But his Lordship forgot, perhaps, that the "frustra" applies not merely to Nowell personally, but the English Church of his day.

mus: quum et Christus sese vel duobus aut tribus, qui suo nomine congregati fuerint, adfuturum polliceatur.* (pp. 103, 104.)

M. Quæ tandem [*i. e.* via qua nos Deus in gratiam recipit] quæso?

A. Ad Dei misericordiam confugiendum est, qua gratis nos in Christo, nullo nostro merito, nec operum respectu, amore et benevolentia complectitur: tum peccata nobis nostra condonans, tum justitia Christi per fidem in ipsum ita nos donans, ut ob eam, perinde ac si nostra esset, ipsi accepti simus. Divinæ ergo per Christum clementiæ justitiam nostram omnem acceptam ferre debemus.†

P. . . . Itaque mera sua misericordia, nulloque operum respectu nos gratis amplectitur in Christo, acceptosque habet, illius justitiam nobis acceptam ferendo, ac si nostra esset, peccata vero nostra nobis non imputando.

M. Unde ista ita esse intelligimus?

A. Ex Evangelio, quod Dei per Christum promissiones continet, quibus dum fidem, id est, certam animi persuasionem, et stabilem benevolentiæ divinæ fiduciam, qualis jam per totum Symbolum est descripta, adjungimus, in hujus, quam dico, justitiæ possessionem, pedem

M. Qualiter ergo dicis justificari nos fide?

P. Quoniam dum certa cordis fiducia amplectimur Evangelii promissiones, hujus, quam dico, justitiæ possessionem quodammodo adipiscimur.

---

* The reader will observe the pointed contradiction here given to Archbishop Laurence's monstrous statement that all in the visible Church are to be considered as the elect.

† On the words, "justitia Christi. . . . nos donans," Bishop Cleaver coolly remarks, "*Accuratius Theologi recentiores* statuerunt doctrinam Justitiæ Christi nobis imputatæ *nullo Scripturarum fundamento inniti.* Et profecto nos per Christum justificamur, vel justi sumus coram Deo, eo quod Deus propter Christum nobis peccata nostra non imputat. Sua justitia ergo non tam donat nos Christus, quam nostra nos injustitia, si ita dicam, in foro exuit. Vide Bulli Opera, cum annotatis Grabii." So that Nowell's Catechism, sanctioned by Convocation, is to be corrected by Bishop Bull's theology! But it is of some use to obtain so explicit a confession of their discrepancy. Bishop Cleaver adds at the end of his Annotations (when noticing a remark on Ecclesiastical discipline) the following curious note, "*Jam tandem video* unde sensus hujus loci est petendus, scilicet ex Catechismo ad normam Disciplinæ Genevensis conscripto, et ab Henrico Stephano, anno 1563, Græce et Latine excuso: *cui profecto non tantum formam et rerum distributionem debebat Nowellus, quin et non raro materiam ipsam doctrinamque: et, quod lectorem ignorare minime velim, partem longe maximam tam sententiarum quam verborum, quæ aut explicatione aut annotatione indigere videbantur.*" (p. 175.) The announcement of the discovery in the "*Jam tandem video,*" and the stopping short at Henry Stephens, without any idea of the Catechism being Calvin's, are somewhat curious. And the fact that the Catechism is Calvin's, will shew us at once, how far the "explicationes" and "annotationes" are admissible.

quodammodo ponimus. (pp. 110, 111.)

M. Non ergo inter hujus justitiæ causas fidem principem locum tenere dicis, ut ejus merito nos ex nobis justi coram Deo habeamur?

A. Nequaquam: id enim esset fidem in Christi locum substituere. Verum *hujus justitiæ fons est Dei misericordia, quæ in nos per Christum derivatur: per Evangelium vero nobis offertur, et a nobis fide, quasi manu, prehenditur.*

M. Fidem igitur non causam sed instrumentum esse justitiæ dicis, *quod scilicet Christum, qui est justitia nostra, amplectitur*, tam arcta nos conjunctione cum illo copulans, ut omnium ejus bonorum participes faciat.

A. Sic est. (p. 111.)

M. Nullis ergo operibus aut meritis Deum antevertere possumus, quibus illum ad benevolentiam beneficentiamque priores provocemus?

A. Nullis plane. Nam nos Deus non solum quum inimici ejus essemus, id est, peccatores, sed et *ante mundi jacta fundamenta in Christo dilexit atque elegit. Et hic est ille, quem dixi, justitiæ nostræ* FONS ATQUE ORIGO. (p. 113.)

Another equally important testimony is to be found in the notes attached to the Bible published by public authority in 1568, commonly called the "Bishops' Bible." This was a new translation of the Bible, accompanied with a few brief notes, undertaken at the suggestion of Archbishop Parker, by various learned men of the day, of whom eight were bishops, and was used in the Churches till the publication of King James's version. The notes were added by the advice of the Archbishop. "The Archbishop directed, reviewed, and finished the whole."*

It was directed by the Canons of 1571, that every Cathedral and Parochial Church should be supplied with this Bible for the use of the people; and that all Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and chief residentiaries at Cathedrals should have a copy of this Bible in their houses, to be placed

* See Horne's Introd., and Lewis's Hist. of Translations, &c.

"either in the hall, or in the great chamber, that they may serve to the use of their servants and of strangers."

A work of more importance, therefore, for ascertaining the genuine doctrine of our Church could not be found.

Now from the notes contained in this volume I extract the following:—

"Gen. xxviii. 15: 'I will not leave thee?' God taketh all the charge of his elect, and never forsaketh them."

"Deut. xxx. 19: 'Choose life.'—That is to say, show thy love and obedience to God, which is not performed by our own strength, but by God's grace working in his elect."

"Rom. ix. 11: 'Election.'—*The will and purpose of God is the cause of the election and reprobation.* For his mercy and calling through Christ are the means of salvation, and the withdrawing of his mercy is the cause of damnation."

"Rom. xi. 35: 'Who hath given unto him first.'—By this the Apostle declareth that God, *by his free will and election,* doth give salvation unto men without any deserts of their own."

"Coloss. i. 26: 'His saints.'—Whom he hath elected and consecrated to him by Christ."

"1 Pet. i. 2: 'Elect according to,' &c.—"*The free election of God is the efficient cause of our salvation:* the material cause is Christ's obedience: our effectual calling is the formal cause, and the final cause is our sanctification."

"2 Pet. i. 10: 'Give the more diligence,' &c.—Albeit it be sure in itself, forasmuch as God cannot change, yet we must confirm it in ourselves by the fruits of the Spirit, knowing that *the purpose of God electeth, calleth, sanctifieth, and justifieth us.*"

It is worthy of notice also in this place, that when in 1565 the printer of the famous Genevan Bible wished for an extension of his privilege to print that Bible, Archbishop Parker and Bishop Grindal wrote a joint letter to Secretary Cecil to induce him to grant it.* The character of the notes to the Genevan Bible is too well known to need extracts.

Another very remarkable and decisive testimony is afforded us by the letters of Bishop Jewel, Archbishop Grindal, and others, to the foreign Calvinistic Reformers.

On Feb. 7, 1562, (just after the Thirty-nine Articles had been

* Strype's Parker, i. 412.

passed in Convocation), Bishop Jewel thus writes to *Peter Martyr,* then at Zurich.

"Now that the full light of the Gospel has shone forth, the very vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed together with the rubbish, and, as the saying is, with the very dust. . . . *As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and* DO NOT DIFFER FROM YOUR DOCTRINE BY A NAIL'S BREADTH."*

Let us proceed to the testimony of Archbishop Grindal, successively Bishop of London, Archbishop of York, and then Parker's successor at Canterbury.

On June 6, 1562, when Bishop of London, he writes thus to Conrad Hubert, at Strasburg. After speaking in high terms of Bucer, and blaming the conduct of some of the Lutherans for proscribing "the Zuinglians," he adds,—

"It is astonishing that they are raising such commotions about predestination. They should at least consult their own Luther on 'The Bondage of the Will.' For what else do *Bucer, Calvin,* and *Martyr* teach, that Luther has not maintained in that treatise? Unless perhaps they wish to take refuge in some recantation of Luther, whom they all but regard as a God. Luther has indeed deserved exceeding well of the Church, and is worthy of being celebrated by all posterity. But he would have been more eminent in my eyes, if these Canaans were not always discovering the nakedness of their father, which all godly persons desire to be concealed. But do you, most learned Conrad, persevere in defending the fame of Bucer, and in maintaining the truth. The Lord will not suffer this cause, which is his own, to be always kept under."†

---

* Zurich Letters, P. S. ed. 1st Ser. p. 100. The original Latin is, "Nunc vero, postquam erupit lux omnis evangelii, quantum quidem fieri potest, vestigia ipsa erroris una cum ruderibus, utque aiunt, cum pulvisculo auferenda sunt. . . . In dogmatis prorsus omnia ad vivum resecavimus, et ne unguem quidem latum absumus a doctrina vestra." (Ib. Pt. 2, p. 59.)

† Zurich Letters, 2d Ser. p. 73. The original Latin is as follows,— "De prædestinatione vero mirum est eos tantas tragœdias excitare. Consulant saltem Lutherum suum in Servo Arbitrio. Quid aliud docent Bucerus, Calvinus, Martyr, quod Lutherus eo libello non docuit? Nisi forte ad aliquam Lutheri, quem tantum non pro Deo habent, palinodiam confugere velint. Optime quidem de ecclesia meritus est Lutherus, dignusque quem omnis posteritas celebret; esset autem mihi celebrior, si non isti Chanaani patris sui nuditatem, quam omnes pii obtectam cupiunt, perpetuo retegerent. Tu vero, Conrade doctissime, perge in Buceri fama tuenda, ac veritate propugnanda. Dominus non sinet hanc causam, quæ ipsius est, perpetuo supprimi." (Ib. Pt. 2, p. 45.)

Again, in August 1566, he thus writes to Henry Bullinger;—

"We who are now Bishops, on our first return, and before we entered on our ministry, contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things that have occasioned the present dispute; but as we were unable to prevail, either with the Queen or the Parliament, we judged it best, after a consultation on the subject, not to desert our Churches for the sake of a few ceremonies, and those not unlawful in themselves, especially since the pure doctrine of the Gospel remained in all its integrity and freedom; in which, even to this day, (notwithstanding the attempts of many to the contrary), WE MOST FULLY AGREE WITH YOUR CHURCHES AND WITH THE CONFESSION YOU HAVE LATELY SET FORTH. And we do not regret our resolution; for in the mean time, the Lord giving the increase, our Churches are enlarged and established, which under other circumstances would have become a prey to the Ecebolians, *Lutherans, and semi-Papists.*"*

The Confession here referred to is the later Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Henry Bullinger in 1566; of course in support of what is called the Calvinistic system of doctrine.

In December 1563, the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Robert Horn, thus writes to Henry Bullinger;—

"*We have throughout England the same ecclesiastical doctrine as yourselves.*"†

In confirmation of these statements we may observe also the following remark of Dr. John Parkhurst, the Bishop of Norwich, in a letter to H. Bullinger, in June 1574.

---

* Zurich Letters, 1st Ser. p. 169. The original Latin is as follows:—"Nos qui nunc episcopi sumus, (eos dico qui in Germania et cæteris locis exulaverant), in primo nostro reditu, priusquam ad ministerium accessimus, diu multumque contendebamus, ut ista, de quibus nunc controvertitur, prorsus amoverentur. Sed cum illud a Regina et Statibus in comitiis regni impetrare non potuimus, communicatis consiliis, optimum judicavimus non deserere ecclesias propter ritus non adeo multos, eosque per se non impios, præsertim quum pura evangelii doctrina nobis integra ac libera maneret, in qua ad hunc usque diem (utcunque multi multa in contrarium moliti sunt) *cum vestris ecclesiis vestraque confessione nuper edita* PLENISSIME *consentimus*. Sed neque adhuc pœnitet nos nostri consilii. Nam interea, Domino dante incrementum, auctæ et confirmatæ sunt ecclesiæ, quæ alioqui Ecceboliis, Lutheranis et Semipapistis prædæ fuissent expositæ." (Ib. Pt. 2, p. 100.)

† Zurich Lett. 1st Ser. p. 135. The original Latin is,—"Nos per totam Angliam eandem habemus ecclesiasticam doctrinam quam vos." (Ib. Pt. 2, p. 81.)

"That Confession of true religion which you published in 1566 is now read in English, and *in the hands of every one.*"*

And as the testimony of our own Bishops was thus decisive as to the agreement of the doctrine of our Church with that of the foreign Calvinistic Churches, so on the other side did the early divines of those Churches profess the agreement of their doctrine with that of the Church of England.

Thus speaks Beza in a letter to Bishop Grindal in 1566,—

"We consider that your Churches agree with us in all points of doctrine."†

And again, in a letter to some person of importance in England (the name is not known) in 1572, he writes,—

"As far as regards the faith itself or the doctrine received in England by public consent and confirmed by Royal authority, I do not think there is any one of those who think sufficiently correctly concerning these things, who does not embrace it as true and certain."‡

Thus also speaks Peter du Moulin of the French Reformed Church;—

"I know that under pretence that the Church of England hath another form of discipline than ours is, our adversaries charge us that our religion is diverse. But experience confuteth this accusation, for we assemble with the Englishmen in their Churches, we participate together in the Holy Supper of our Lord; *the doctrine of their Confessions is wholly agreeable unto ours.*"§

Another evidence of the doctrine of our Church in the time of Queen Elizabeth is to be found in the fact, that the Bishops of that period considered the Puritans as not differing from them

---

* Zurich Lett. 1st. Ser. p. 304. "Confessio illa veræ religionis, quam 1566 edidisti, loquitur Anglice, et omnium manibus teritur." (Ib. Pt. 2, p. 178.)

† "Vestras ecclesias . . . nobiscum in omnibus doctrinæ capitibus consentire arbitramur." (Ep. viii. Tract. Theol. vol. 3, Genev. 1582, fol. p. 209.)

‡ "Quod ad fidem ipsam sive doctrinam istic publico consensu receptam Regiaque auctoritate confirmatam attinet, nullum esse arbitror eorum qui satis recte de his rebus sentiunt, qui non eam ut veram ac certam amplectatur." (Ep. 69, Ib. p. 283.)

§ The Buckler of the Faith, or a Defence of the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches in France, by P. Du Moulin. Translated into English. Lond. 1620, 4to. p. 345.

in *doctrine*, but only in the matter of *rites and ceremonies*. Thus Dr. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, says of the Puritans in 1573,—

"The *doctrine* alone they leave *untouched*."*

And Dr. Bridges, when Dean of Salisbury, in 1587 (afterwards Bishop of Oxford) says,—

"The controversies between the common adversaries [the Papists] and us, are *pro aris et focis*, for matters, and that capital matters, of the substance and life of our Christian religion; not trifles, as some neutrals would bear the people in hand. . . . . Whereas, *the controversies betwixt us and our brethren* [the Puritans] *are matters, or rather (as they call them) but manners and forms of the Church's regiment*."†

These two last extracts I have already given in a former publication,‡ but I repeat them here as important parts of the chain of evidence to which this chapter is devoted.

For the same reason I must again notice the very forcible testimony supplied by the Statute of the University of Oxford, in 1579, for "*the extirpation of every heresy, and the instruction of youth in true piety*," in which it was ordered that the students should use *either* Nowell's Larger Catechism, OR *Calvin's Catechism*, or the Elements of Christian Religion by *Andrew Hyperius*, or the *Heidelberg* Catechism, according to the capacity of the hearers and the pleasure of readers; and that to these might be added *Bullinger's* Catechism for Adults, and *Calvin's Institutions*, or the Apology of the Church of England, or the Articles of Religion. And all Catechisms "opposed to this sound doctrine, and other superstitious and Papistical books," were interdicted.§

---

* Lett. to Gualter, July 1573, in Zur. Lett. 1st Ser. p. 287. "Solam doctrinam nobis integram relinquunt." (Ib. Pt. 2, p. 168.)

† Defence of Gov. establ. in Ch. of England. Lond. 1587, 4to. Pref. p. 3.

‡ Vindication of the "Defence of the XXXIX Articles."

§ 1. Ad extirpandam hæresim quamcunque et ad informandam in vera pietate juventutem, libros hosce legendos censemus et statuimus, viz., Catechismum Alexandri Novelli Majorem Latine et Græce, vel Catechismum Johannis Calvini Latine Græce et Hebraice, vel Elementa Christianæ Religionis Andreæ Hyperii, vel Catechesin Heydelburgensem, pro captu auditorum et arbitrio legentium.

2. His adjungi possunt Henrici Bullingeri Catechesis pro adultis, et Institutiones Calvini, vel Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, vel Articuli Religionis

Another remarkable testimony of the same kind is the fact, that at the Convocation in 1586, "the Archbishop and Bishops" agreed to certain "Orders," of which the first was this,—

"Every minister having cure, and being under the degrees of Master of Art and Bachelor of Law, and not licensed to be a public preacher, shall, before the 2nd day of February next, provide a Bible and *Bullinger's Decads*, in Latin or English, and a paper-book. And shall every day read over one chapter of the Holy Scriptures; and note the principal contents thereof briefly in his paper-book. And shall *every week read over one sermon in the said Decads*; and *note likewise the chief matters therein contained in the said paper* [*book*]. And shall, once in every quarter . . . *show his said notes to some preacher near adjoining*, to be assigned for that purpose."

And by the second "Order," the said preachers are to certify to the Archdeacon or Bishop, "who do perform the said exercises, and how they have profited therein."*

And accordingly, in the following January we find Dr. Aylmer, Archdeacon of London, and son of the Bishop, ordering all ministers, not preachers, in his archdeaconry to have "*Bullinger's Decads*."†

This surely is a decisive proof what was the character of the publicly received doctrine of our Church at that time.

From these testimonies as to the public doctrine of the Church, I pass on to review the doctrine maintained by its leading bishops and divines during the period respecting which we are now inquiring. And the only difficulty with which we have to contend arises from the paucity of their writings; for so far as testimonies are to be found as to their views on the subject under consideration in this chapter, their evidence is altogether such as the proofs already adduced of the real doctrine of our Church would lead us to expect.

in Synodo Londinensi conscripti et authoritate Regia editi cum explicatione locorum communium testimoniis a sacra Scriptura aut interdum e Patribus desumptis. Ad primam lectionem juniores, ad secundam provectiores omnes nullo gradu insignitos astringi volumus.

3. Catechismos omnes, sanæ huic doctrinæ contrarios, aliosque libros superstitiosos et papisticos legi et haberi interdicimus. (Ant. a Wood, Hist. et Antiq. Univ. Oxon. vol. I. p. 296, ed. 1574.)

* Strype's Whitgift, Appendix, No. 32. iii. 194, 195. Oxf. ed. See also Wilkins's Concilia, iv. 321.

† Strype's Aylmer, p. 83.

And first let us take the series of Primates in the Sees both of Canterbury and York.

First, Archbishop Parker. His writings unfortunately are not sufficiently extensive to supply us with the most direct testimony to his views. But still we have what is sufficient for the purpose. For, first, we have already seen what was the doctrine inculcated in the notes to the Bible published under his superintendence and authority. Moreover, from his testimony to the doctrine of Bucer, we may fairly infer his own. Again; another strong though indirect testimony of the Archbishop's views is to be found in the books he gave to the Cambridge University Library. Of four parcels of 25 vols. each, the first of which contained Bibles, Concordances, Greek Scholia, and some historical works, and the last some miscellaneous MSS., the second and third consisted of Commentaries on the Old and New Testament; which were these,—John Calvin on the Pentateuch, Munster on several books of the Bible, Gualter on the 12 Minor Prophets, Calvin's Institutions, Musculus's Common Places, Beza on the New Testament, Erasmus's Annotations and Paraphrase on the New Testament, Calvin's Harmony of the four Evangelists, Bucer on the four Gospels, Robert Stephens on three Gospels, Zuinglius on the four Gospels, Fox and Pantaleon's Martyrologies.* No one surely can read this list without seeing at once the character of Parker's theology.

Again; we have seen in a preceding page (p. 65), the notice taken by Parker, in a work published towards the close of his career, of the divines of the foreign "Reformed" Churches, brought over here by Cranmer, to aid him in strengthening "the evangelical doctrine" in this kingdom. Here again we have pretty good evidence of his views in the language he uses respecting them; so utterly opposed to that of the divines who call themselves "High Churchmen."

And to this may be added, that his Chaplain, Dr. John Man, translated, by his advice and encouragement, the Common Places of Musculus, and dedicated the book to the Archbishop,†

* Strype's Parker, book 4, ch. 42, ii 409, 410. Oxf. ed.
† Strype's Parker, book 1, ch. 46, ii. 169. Oxf. ed.

who recommended it to the Church, as we learn on the authority of Haddon as quoted by Strype.*

The successor of Parker in the See of Canterbury was Grindal, whose view of the doctrine of our Church we have already seen. I add the following as another testimony of *his own* views. It occurs in a letter from him, when Archbishop of York, to Rodolph Gualter, in July 1573.

"Health in Christ, my very dear master Gualter. Your desire that your lately published Homilies on the First Epistle to the Corinthians should appear under my name and that of some other very dear brethren and fellow-labourers was very gratifying to me. . . . Although you are not personally known to me, you are well known to me by your writings, abounding as they do in singular erudition and learning: and on account of the excellent piety which they breathe, and I will add too, on account of *our most close agreement in the true doctrine of Christ*, you are most dear to me."†

The next Primate was Dr. John Whitgift, of whom it is perhaps still less necessary than in the case of Dr. Grindal to say much as to his doctrinal views; he being the Primate by whom the famous "Lambeth Articles" (well known, and universally admitted, to be thoroughly "Calvinistic," as it is called) were put forth in 1595. I shall give presently a further account of these Articles. I will just add, however, an extract from the Archbishop's "Defence of the Answer to the Admonition," which may not be so well known, and which has a direct and important bearing on the subject of this work. He says,—

"There are two kinds of government in the Church; the one, invisible; the other, visible; the one, spiritual; the other, external. The invisible and spiritual government of the Church is, when God by his Spirit, gifts, and ministry of his word, doth govern it, by ruling in the hearts and consciences of men, and directing them in all things necessary to everlasting life: *this kind of government indeed is necessary to salvation, and* IT IS IN THE CHURCH OF THE ELECT ONLY."‡

The successor of Whitgift was Dr. Richard Bancroft, translated from London to Canterbury in 1604. He was a cele-

---

* Ib.

† Zurich Lett. 1st Ser. p. 293. . . . . "propter arctissimam in vera Christi doctrina consensionem carissimus." (Ib. Pt. 2, p. 171.)

‡ Defence of Answer to Admonition, 1574, fol. p. 80.

brated opponent of the factious proceedings of the Puritans, in matters of Church government and discipline. But what his view of the *doctrine* of the Church of England was, may be judged from the Exposition of the Articles published in 1607, by his Chaplain Thomas Rogers, with a dedication to him; a book which (we are told by a contemporary) "came abroad with injunction from the Archbishop that then was [Dr. Bancroft] that there should be *one of them bought for every parish in the Province of Canterbury.*"*

I will give a few extracts from Rogers's Commentary on the 17th Article.

"They which are predestinate unto salvation cannot perish."

"Wander then do they from the truth which think,—

"That the very elect totally and finally may fall from grace and be damned;

"That the regenerate may fall from the grace of God, may destroy the temple of God, and be broken off from the vine Christ Jesus; which was one of Glover's errors;

"That the number of those which be predestinate, may both increase and be diminished: so thought the Pelagians"———

"Of the mere will and purpose of God, some men in Christ Jesus are elected, and not others, unto salvation.

"The proof from God's word.

"In the Scripture we read of man's predestination the cause efficient to be the everlasting purpose of God: Rom. ix. 11, Eph. i. 5, 2 Tim. i. 9: the cause formal, God his infinite mercy and goodness; Exod. xxxiii. 19, Rom. ix. 15: the cause material, the blood of Christ; Eph. i. 4, 5; 1 Tim. i. 18, 20: the cause final or end, why both God the Father hath loved, and Christ for his elect hath suffered, is the glory of God; Eph. i. 6, Prov. xvi. 4: and the salvation of man; Rom. viii. 29, Rom. ix. 21.

"*And this do all the Churches militant and reformed, with a sweet consent, testify and acknowledge.*

"Hereby is discovered the impiety of those men which think that,

* * * * *

"God beheld in every man whether he would use his grace well and believe the gospel or no; and as he saw a man affected, so did predestinate, choose, or refuse him.

"Besides his will there was some other cause in God, why he

---

† Dr. Burges's Baptismal Regeneration of Elect Infants. Oxf. 1629. 4to. p. 68.

chose one and cast off another man; but this cause is hidden from us."———

"They who are elected unto salvation, if they come unto years of discretion, are called both outwardly by the word, and inwardly by the Spirit of God.

"Though true it be, the Lord knoweth all and every of his elect; yet hath he revealed unto us certain notes and tokens, whereby we may see and certainly know, whether we be of that number or not. For such as be ordained unto everlasting life, if they live long in this world, they one time or other be called unto the knowledge of salvation, by the preaching of God's word; they obey that calling, through the operation of the Holy Ghost working within them; they feel in their souls the same Spirit bearing witness unto their spirits how they are the children of God; and finally they walk religiously in all good works. . . .

"Sundry adversaries hath this truth, and

"*First the Papists, who teach that none are to think or persuade themselves, that they are of the number of the Predestinate unto salvation, but to be ever doubtful thereof.*"———

"The Predestinate are both justified by faith, sanctified by the Spirit, and shall be glorified in the life to come."———

"This doctrine of Predestination is to the godly full sweet, pleasant, and comfortable, because it greatly confirmeth their faith in Christ, and increaseth their love toward God . . . But to the wicked and reprobate the consideration hereof is very sour, unsavory, and most uncomfortable, as that which they think (though very untruly and sinfully) causeth them either to despair of his mercy, being without faith, or not to fear his justice, being extremely wicked: whereas, neither from the word of God, nor any confession of the Church, can any man gather that he is a vessel of wrath, prepared to damnation; but contrary-wise by many and great arguments may persuade himself that God would not his destruction . . . . . Therefore they are to be taken as much out of the way, which say, that this doctrine leadeth either unto desperation, which is without all comfort, or unto looseness of life, and so unto Atheism; and therefore to be published neither by mouth nor book; and so thought both the Pelagians and the Predestinates (a sort of hereties so called) in old time, and the *Family of Love in our days*, who term the doctrine of Predestination a licentious doctrine, and say it filleth all the prisons almost in England."*

---

* The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion professed and protected in the Realm of England, &c. See on Art. 17. I have quoted from the edition published in 1625, 4to.

Without going further, these extracts are, I suppose, amply sufficient to show the view of doctrine maintained in this, the first and a publicly authorized, Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, and one which Archbishop Bancroft ordered all the parishes in his Province to supply themselves with.

In 1610 Bancroft was succeeded by Dr. George Abbot, whose views of doctrine it is quite unnecessary to prove, as they are well known to, and recognised by, all parties as being decidedly Calvinistic.

I now pass to the Archbishops of York during the same period.

Of the first, Dr. Thomas Young, I find no remains or notice from which his views are to be gathered.

His successor was Grindal, whose case has already been considered.

The successor of Grindal was Dr. Edwin Sandys. Scarcely anything has come down to us of his writings except some sermons, and it is, of course, seldom, except through controversial works, that we are able to prove the precise views of any one on the points we are now considering. Judging however both from his sermons and conduct, it will I think be admitted, that there can be little doubt that his theology was like that of his predecessor. And a passage in one of his sermons certainly expresses that view of doctrine, where he says that "holiness is the *end* of our *election*."*

The next that filled the Archiepiscopal chair at York was John Piers, of whom nothing remains by which to judge of his doctrine.

Piers's successor was Dr. Matthew Hutton, who was appointed in 1594. Here again we have decisive testimony as to the doctrine held, Dr. Hutton having, as Archbishop of York, united with Whitgift in the publication of the Lambeth Articles, and left a treatise written in favour of the theological views therein maintained; to which I need only here refer the reader.†

---

* Sandys' Works, P. S. ed. p. 190.

† Brevis et dilucida explicatio veræ, certæ, et consolationis plenæ doctrinæ de Electione, Prædestinatione, ac Reprobatione. Hardrovici. 1613. 12mo.

These were all that held the See during the reign of Elizabeth; but I may add, that in 1605, Hutton was succeeded at York by Dr. Tobie Matthew. Of the writings of this able and excellent prelate, but one Sermon was printed, which was a reply to Campian. He left, however, a large number of sermons in M S., two of which were printed not long since in the pages of a periodical publication.* The general character of his doctrinal system may be easily gathered from them, and it is evidently similar to that of his predecessors.

An uninterrupted succession, then, of such prelates in the Archiepiscopal Sees of Canterbury and York, for so many years from the commencement of the Restoration of our Reformed Church on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, is surely of itself a very strong testimony as to the character of the doctrine then maintained among us as the established doctrine of our Church.

I am not here attempting to accumulate all the evidences that might be adduced on this subject, otherwise it would be necessary to show, how completely the evidence we have as to the views of their brethren on the Episcopal bench, shows that the series of Archbishops may be taken as correct representations of the great body, if not the whole, of their brethren. Their doctrine may fairly be considered as, *for that period*, a test of the general character of the theology of those appointed to the Episcopal Bench. Nor is it possible to obtain many testimonies *of any kind* to the views of the Bishops; inasmuch as few, comparatively, of the prelates of that period have left anything behind them in print from which their doctrine may be deduced. Of those appointed during the whole of the first fifty years after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, I can find but twenty-nine of whom there are any remains, and of these but twelve where those remains are more than three or four sermons or letters, namely, James Pilkington, of Durham; Robert Horn, of Winchester; T. Cooper, of Winchester; T. Bilson, of Winchester; Lancelot Andrews, then of Ely; W. Alley, of Exeter;

---

* The Christian Observer for October, November, December and Appendix, for 1847.

J. Woolton, of Exeter; W. Barlow, of Lincoln; F. Godwin, then of Llandaff; J. Bridges, of Oxford; J. Jewel, of Salisbury; and Gervase Babington, of Worcester. Of these, it will, I think, be found, that the doctrine of all who have spoken on the subject, (excepting, to a certain extent, Andrews, who was appointed when the stream was beginning to turn,) is similar to that of the occupants of the Archiepiscopal Sees. And the same might, I believe, be said of the remainder of the twenty-nine. The case of Andrews I shall presently notice.

I cannot think it necessary, however, to the establishment of the fact I am now endeavouring to prove, to enter further into the views maintained at that period by the Episcopal Bench as a body.

I now proceed briefly to notice the character of the theological views taught by the Regius and Margaret Professors of Theology at the two Universities.

I begin with Oxford, and the Regius Professors of Theology there. The first in the time of Edward VI. was Peter Martyr, of whose views it is unnecessary to say a word. He was succeeded, of course, by Roman Catholics, in the reign of Mary. The first appointed on the accession of Elizabeth was Laurence Humphrey, of whom the High Church biographer, Anthony Wood, gives the following account:—

"The truth is, that from the city of Zurich (remarkable for the preachings and death of Zwinglius) and the correspondence that he had at Geneva, he brought back with him, at his return into England, so much of the Calvinian, both in doctrine and discipline, that the best that could be said of him was, that he was a moderate and conscientious Non-conformist." He "sowed also in the Divinity school such seeds of Calvinism, and laboured to create in the younger sort such a strong hatred against the Papists, as if nothing but divine truths were to be found in the one, and nothing but abominations were to be seen in the latter." "Sure it is, that Humphrey was a great and general scholar, an able linguist, a deep divine; and for his excellency of style, exactness of method, and substance of matters in his writings, he went beyond most of our theologists." And he then adds the high character given of him by Archbishop Tobie

Matthew.* Such was the first Regius Professor on the accession of Q. Elizabeth.

In 1589 he was succeeded by Thomas Holland, of whom Wood says—

"He was esteemed by the precise men of his time and after, another Apollos, mighty in Scriptures, and so familiar with the Fathers, as if he himself was a Father; and in the Schoolmen, as if he had been a seraphical doctor."† But he held the same doctrinal views as his predecessor; for Wood, speaking of his successor Robert Abbot, says, he was "a more moderate Calvinian than either of his two predecessors, Holland and Humphrey, in the divinity chair, were, which he expressed by countenancing the sublapsarian way of Predestination."‡

We have here, then, a testimony as to the views of his successor, Robert Abbot, appointed Professor in 1612. The only improvement (in Wood's view) in the occupant of the chair, was that Abbot "countenanced the *sublapsarian* way of predestination." And he is compelled to bear the same testimony to his character and learning as in the case of his predecessors.

"He was a person of unblameable life and conversation, a profound divine, most admirably well read in the Fathers, Councils, and Schoolmen."§

The reader will find his doctrinal views, on the points now under consideration, in his Work, "De Gratia et Perseverantia Sanctorum," Lond. 1618, 4to.

In 1615, on the appointment of Abbot to a bishopric, succeeded John Prideaux, another staunch Calvinist. He is called by Wood "a stout champion against Socinus and *Arminius;* and it is added,—"All that knew him esteemed him a noted artist, a plentiful fountain of all sorts of learning, an excellent linguist, a person of a prodigious memory, and so profound a divine that they have been pleased to entitle him 'Columna fidei orthodoxæ,' and 'malleus hæreseeus, patrum pater,' and 'ingens scholæ et academiæ oraculum.'"‖

---

* Athen. Oxon. i. 557; ed. Bliss.
† Athen. Oxon. ii. 111. ‡ Id. ib. ii. 225. § Id. ib. col. 224.
‖ Id. ib. iii. 266, 267.

For his own account of his views, the reader may refer to his "Lectiones," and "Fasciculus Controversiarum."

From the Regius Professors let us go to the Margaret Professors. The first after the accession of Queen Elizabeth was Francis Babington, of whom I can find no account.

The next, in 1562, was Herbert Westphaling, of the nature of whose doctrine on the points now under consideration, I can find no testimony.

To him succeeded, in 1563, James Calfhill, who was nominated in 1570 to the bishopric of Worcester, but died before consecration. Of his theology we have again the same testimony. He was "very orthodox, and a great admirer of all Calvin's opinions."*

To Calfhill succeeded, in 1565, Edward Cradock, and to Cradock, in 1594, John Williams; whose views I have not yet been able to ascertain.

But in 1613 the chair was given to Sebastian Benefield, whose Calvinistic views are well known. The following character is given of him by Wood.

"He was a person for piety, strictness of life, and sincere conversation incomparable. He was also so noted an humanitian, disputant, and theologist, and so well read in the Fathers and Schoolmen, that he had scarce his equal in the University. . . . He was accounted no mean lover of the opinions of John Calvin, especially as to the points of predestination."†

The reader will find a full confirmation of this account of his doctrinal views in the following among his other works: "Eight Sermons publicly preached in the University of Oxford. Oxford, 1614," 4to. "The Sin against the Holy Ghost discovered, and other Christian doctrines delivered, in 12 Sermons upon part of Heb. x. Oxford, 1615." 4to. In these works it will be found that his Calvinism advanced even to the extent of maintaining that Christ died for the elect only.

Such were the Theological Professors at the University of

---

* Kippis's Biographia Britannica, vol. 3. p. 51.

† Athen. Oxon. ii. 157.

Oxford, for the first half century and more after the accession of Queen Elizabeth.

Let us now go to the sister University of Cambridge, beginning as before with the Regius Professors.

The first was Martin Bucer, appointed in 1550 by King Edward VI. Of him nothing need be said.

Shortly after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, Leonard Pilkington was appointed to the chair. Of his views I can find no testimony.

To Pilkington succeeded, in 1562, Matthew Hutton, afterwards Archbishop of York, whose views I have already noticed.

Next came, in 1567, John Whitgift, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, whose doctrine has also been already pointed out.

To Whitgift succeeded, in the same year, William Chaderton. Of W. Chaderton's writings nothing has been printed, nor have I found any direct testimony as to his doctrinal views.*

The successor of Chaderton, in 1580, was the celebrated William Whitaker, of whose Calvinistic views it is of course superfluous to say a word.

In 1596 came John Overall, whose views I shall notice more particularly when I come to deal with the case of Barret and the Hampton Court Conference, and shall show that though he differed in some respects from his predecessors in the theological chair, his differences were *very far less* than might be supposed from the way in which his views have often been referred to in modern times.

The period when he resigned the chair, is not exactly known; but it was probably about 1613, when he was succeeded by John Richardson, of whose views I have found no testimony.

I proceed to the Margaret Professors of Divinity.

The first appointed after the accession of Queen Elizabeth was Robert Beaumont. Nothing of his writing remains, nor can I find any particular notice of his views; but they may be judged

---

* His kinsman, Laurence Chaderton, a contemporary, and afterwards Head of Emanuel College, as William was of Queen's, was a zealous Calvinist. And as W. Chaderton's great patron was the Earl of Leicester, (Strype's Ann. II. ii. 200), we can have little doubt as to his views.

of by the fact of his supporting the movement in the Convocation of 1562 against the habits, &c.*

His successor, appointed in the same year, was Matthew Hutton, afterwards Regius Professor and Archbishop of York, whose views I have already pointed out.

In 1566 was appointed John Whitgift, whose case has also been considered.

In 1567 succeeded William Chaderton, afterwards Regius Professor, of whom I have spoken before.

To Chaderton succeeded Thomas Cartwright, who afterwards became the celebrated Nonconformist, and whose decided Calvinism will not of course be questioned by any one.

After him came John Hanson and John Styll, of neither of whom can I find any information as to their precise views.

The next was Peter Baro, whose views, no doubt, were of what is now called an Arminian complexion, and *he was compelled by the Heads of the University, with the manifest approval of the Archbishops, to resign his professorship on that account.* So that his case, though an exception as far as his own personal views are concerned, strengthens the evidence for the general prevalence in our Church, at that period, of the doctrine now called "Calvinistic." I shall notice his case again in connexion with the Lambeth Articles.

Baro's successor was Thomas Playfere, and it is hardly necessary to say, that Baro having been compelled to retire on account of his Arminian views, Playfere's doctrine restored the Calvinism of the professorial chair, as his Sermons show. I will give a few extracts from them.

In a Sermon on Ps. xxxii. 6, entitled "The Felicity of the Faithful," he says,—

"Whereby we may see the absurdity of the Papists. They would prove that justifying grace may be lost, because some have made shipwreck of faith. But if we should grant them that the Apostle (1 Tim. i. 19) speaketh of justifying not of historical faith, yet we have the help of a second answer. To wit, that shipwreck is one

* See Strype's Annals, I. i. 501, 504; and see Strype's Parker, I. 386.

thing, and drowning another. Therefore faith which is wreckt is not by and bye drowned. For it may happen to suffer shipwreck as S. Paul did, and swim out safe to the shore. But this is but a touch by the way. Mean season we see how safe and secure the faithful man is in Christ. He is a house to which the floods may come near to shake it, but never to throw it down; he is a ship which the waves may come near to toss it, but never to turn it over: even as St. Peter began to sink, but still kept up his head; and St. Paul suffered shipwreck, but was not a hair the worse for it. 'Surely in the flood of many waters, they shall not come near him.'"*

Again elsewhere,—

"It is nothing but a slander which the Church of Rome casteth upon us, that forsooth we should teach a man whose person is justified by faith in Christ committing some foul act, is never a whit the worse for it. Nay, our doctrine is this, that such an one hath hurt himself two ways. In respect of his own guiltiness, and in respect of God's righteousness. For the first, though God for his part do not break off the purpose of adoption and adjudge him to wrath, and therefore he is not guilty of condemnation for sin; yet he is simply guilty of sin, and hath grievously wounded his own conscience. For the second, though God again hath pardoned all the sins of his elect, even those that are to come, by his decree, by his promise, by the value and price of his son's merits, yet absolutely and actually he doth not apply this pardon to the apprehension and feeling of the sinner's faith, till he recover himself, and renew his repentance. Marry this we teach, that God upholdeth his chosen children so by faith and repentance, that it is impossible any of them should die in final impenitency. But that sweet sanctifying Spirit which dwelleth in them, is still busy like a bee as we say, and never leaveth stinging them, and stirring them up to repentance, and working them like wax (as it were) till as much as it was before grieved for their aversion by sin, so much it be after delighted for their conversion by amendment of life. Therefore as they all need not to doubt a whit of their salvation, who after they have fallen asleep in sin, awake betimes, and 'water their couch with their tears,' so I assure you, holy brethren, their case is dangerous and desperate, nay, they are in a cursed case, which will not be awaked,

* Nine Sermons preached by Dr. T. Playfere. Cambridge, 1612, 8vo, pp. 213, 214.

but lie still sleeping and snoring in sin. Seeing no pardon can be procured, but where repentance is renewed."*

Again, in the same Sermon, further on, he speaks thus:

"But now some man may further object and say, He is not yet fully satisfied for this latter part, because, talk as long as we will, all these inconveniences which come, as hath been declared, by persevering in sin are either no bridle at all, or else not so strong a bridle to restrain men from sin as if they be persuaded, they may by sinning quite and clean lose all justifying grace, and so may be finally impenitent when they die. But he which will put forth this doubt must remember that the children of God are led by the Spirit of God. And the Spirit, though not in the same degree, yet in the same sort, worketh in all those that have been, are, or shall be sanctified; who as they serve God not for any servile fear of losing their faith, or of dying in impenitency, or such like, but only for pure love of his Majesty, so they can neither will nor choose, but being bitten with sin, they must needs in their souls and consciences feel the smart of it.... As Elihu then kept silence somewhile even from good words, though it were pain and grief to him; but at the last the fire kindling and his heart being hot within him spake with his tongue, so the Spirit of God in all the elect of God is like wine put into a bottle, which will have a vent to spurge out, or else it will burst the bottle, or like fire raked up in embers, which will have a passage to burn out, or else it will consume the whole house. And therefore Saint John likewise saith, Whosoever is born of God, doth not sin, for his seed remaineth in him, neither can he sin, because he is born of God. Mark ye this well. The Apostle thinketh it not enough to say, He doth not sin, but addeth moreover, He cannot sin. What is that? To wit, presumptuously without fear he doth not sin; and desperately without remorse he cannot sin.... Why so? Because the seed of God remaineth still in him. And what is the seed of God? It is the Spirit of God.... So that this is a legal kind of preaching to say, Take heed you sin not; ye may happen so to lose your faith; to lose all the justifying grace which God hath given us; to be for ever excluded out of the kingdom of heaven. This is to be said to vassals, to drudges, to slaves, not to sons. To sons this may be better said, Take heed ye sin not; God hath adopted you and given you the earnest of his Spirit. Therefore grieve not this sweet Spirit, whereby ye are sealed up to the day of redemption.

---

* The Sick Man's Couch, a sermon [on Ps. vi. 6.] before Prince Henry, Mar. 12, 1604. By T. Playfere, Prof. &c.—Ed. used is Lond. 1617, 8vo. pp. 40, 41.

If ye be loving children indeed, though there were no hell to fear, no heaven to hope for, no torments to dread, no rewards to expect, yet ye will obey your good Father, and be the sorrowfullest creatures in the world if you have but once displeased him, only for the mere love ye bear towards him, and for the unspeakable love he hath shown towards you."*

After Playfere came, in 1609, John Davenant, one of the representatives of our Church at the Synod of Dort, and afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, whose Calvinism will not of course be disputed.

Now I would ask any impartial reader, if he can fairly look in the face the remarkable testimony thus afforded us by these almost unbroken lines of "Calvinistic" Primates and University theological Professors, in illustration of the doctrine of our Church as settled at the accession of Queen Elizabeth, and deny that our Formularies were intended to favour what is called Calvinism.

From the divines of that period, I might of course add numerous testimonies in favor of the same views of doctrine, but I can hardly conceive further evidence to be necessary.

I must not fail, however, to direct the attention of the reader to the theology of Hooker, the "judicious" Hooker. The doctrine of the author of such passages as the following cannot be a matter of doubt.

"In this we know we are not deceived, neither can we deceive you, when we teach that the faith whereby ye are sanctified cannot fail; it did not in the Prophet, it shall not in you. . . . There was in Habakkuk that which St. John doth call 'the seed of God,' meaning thereby the First Grace which God poureth into the hearts of them that are incorporated into Christ; which having received, if because it is an adversary to sin, we do therefore think we sin not both otherwise, and also by distrustful and doubtful apprehending of that which we ought steadfastly to believe, surely we do but deceive ourselves. Yet they which are of God do not sin either in this, or in any thing, any such sin as doth quite extinguish grace, clean cut them off from Christ Jesus; because the 'seed of God' abideth in them, and doth shield them from receiving any irremediable wound."†

* Ib. pp. 51–55.

† Sermon on the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect. Works, ed. Keble, vol. 3. Pt. 2, pp. 588, 589.

"If he which once hath the Son, may cease to have the Son, though it be but a moment, he ceaseth for that moment to have life. But the life of them which live by the Son of God, is everlasting in the world to come. But because, as Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more, death hath no more power over him; so the *justified man*, being alive to God in Jesus Christ our Lord, doth *as necessarily from that time forward always live, as Christ, by whom he hath life, liveth always.*"*

"The first thing of his so infused into our hearts in this life is the Spirit of Christ; whereupon, because the rest, of what kind soever, do all both necessarily depend, and *infallibly also ensue*, therefore, &c."†

"So that all his foreknown elect are predestinated, called, justified, and advanced unto glory, according to that determination and purpose which he hath of them, neither is it possible that *any other* should be glorified, or *can be justified and called*, or were predestinated, besides them which in that manner are foreknown."‡

But one of the most decisive testimonies on the subject we are considering, is the case of W. Barret at Cambridge, in the year 1595. And it is one in which the partial deviation of the party concerned from the doctrine of his contemporaries, and the way in which his case was dealt with, supply us with very remarkably clear evidence as to the prevailing system of theology in our Church at that time. And I must add, that a very mistaken view has often been taken of the doctrine of Barret himself. Arminian writers of modern times have frequently been disposed to claim him and all who supported him (who, however, were scarcely half-a-dozen persons) as maintainers of *their* views against the doctrines of Calvin; in order that they may appear to have had a portion of our Church in their favour, even at that time. Consequently, this opponent of some of the *extreme* points of the highest Calvinistic doctrine has been held forth as the champion of Arminianism in the reign of Elizabeth. And, agreeably to the ordinary way in which such matters have been dealt with among us in modern times, when ecclesiastical studies have been left to the spare moments which could be

---

* Disc. of Justification, § 26. Ib. 642, 643.

† Eccl. Pol. V. lvi. 11, vol. 2, p. 324.

‡ Fragments of Answer to Christian Letter; Works, ed. Keble. vol. 2, p. 751.

afforded from the *real* study of classical literature, philosophy, science, natural history, architecture, the belles lettres, and the fine arts, the most superficial statements have been considered amply sufficient to settle the question. I must take the liberty, however, of requesting those who are desirous of knowing the truth, to inquire a little further into this matter.

The details have been given very fully by Strype, in his Life of Whitgift, from which I take the following account. The statements of Barret which gave offence were delivered by him in a sermon "ad clerum," before the University, and he was first required to make a public retractation of them in the same place in which the sermon was delivered, in a form of words prepared for him by some of the Heads of the University. As this retractation clearly shews the view of the Heads of the University as to the received doctrine of our Church at that time, I shall here give it entire, as printed by Strype.

"When I was preaching in Latin a few days since in the Church of the University, O most learned men, many things fell from me which were both untruly and rashly uttered; by which I understand the minds of many were wounded. That I may therefore make satisfaction to the Church and the truth, both which I have publicly injured, I publicly confess, both by recounting and recalling, my errors.

"First, I said that no one in this frail world was so firmly supported, at least with the certainty of faith, that is, except (as I afterwards explained myself) by revelation, that he ought to be secure of his own salvation. But now I profess before God, and acknowledge in my conscience, that those who are justified by faith have peace towards God, that is, reconciliation with God, and through faith in him stand by grace. Therefore that they ought to be certain and secure of their own salvation, with the certainty of faith itself.

"Secondly, I asserted that the faith of Peter could not have failed, but that the faith of others may. For (as I then said) the Lord did not pray for the faith of individuals. But now with a better and sounder judgment, taught by the words of Christ when he said (John xvii. 20), 'I pray not for these,' that is, the Apostles, 'only, but also for those who shall believe on me through their word;' I acknowledge that Christ prayed for the faith of individuals; and that through the efficacy of that prayer of Christ all that truly believe are so supported, that their faith cannot fail.

"Thirdly, As it regards final perseverance, I said that that security

concerning a thing future, and one of its own nature contingent, of which kind is the perseverance of every man, was proud. Nor did I only pronounce it to be proud, but most impious. But now I frankly profess, that true and justifying faith, by which the faithful are most closely united to Christ, is so immovable and also certain of the future, that it can never, by any temptations of the flesh, the world, or the devil himself, be entirely rooted out of the minds of the faithful. So that he who once possesses it, will always possess it. For by the blessing of this justifying faith Christ dwells in us and we in Christ. Therefore it cannot but both increase (Christ daily growing in us) and persevere even to the end, (because God bestows constancy.)

"Fourthly, I affirmed that there was no difference in faith, but in those that believe. In which matter I confess that I erred. I now willingly acknowledge that a temporary faith (which, as Bernard testifies, is therefore feigned because it is temporary) is distinguished not in measure and degrees but intrinsically, and differs from that life-giving faith by which sinners apprehending Christ are justified for ever before God; moreover I add, that James makes mention of a dead faith, and Paul of one that works by love.

"Fifthly, I added that remission of sins was an article of faith, but not special to individuals, that is (as I explained it) that every truly faithful man neither could nor ought to believe with certainty that his sins are remitted to him. But now I think otherwise, and frankly confess, that every truly faithful man is bound by this Article of belief (namely, 'I believe the remission of sins') to believe with certainty that his own particular sins are freely remitted to him; and that it does not hence follow that that petition in the Lord's Prayer (namely, 'Forgive us our trespasses') is superfluous. For in that prayer we seek as well the gift as the increase of faith.

"Sixthly, These words fell from me in my sermon, namely, As it regards those who are not saved, I most firmly believe, and I frankly profess that I so believe, against Calvin, Peter Martyr, and the rest, that sin is the true, proper, and primary cause of reprobation. But being now better taught, I affirm that the reprobation of the wicked is from eternity, and that that saying of Augustine to Simplician is most true, namely, 'If sin were the cause of reprobation, then none would be elected, since God foreknows all to be polluted with it'; and (to act frankly) I no otherwise think and believe of the doctrine of election and reprobation, than the Church of England believes and teaches in the Book of the Articles of Faith, in the Article of Predestination, in this manner, 'Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of

the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called, according to God's purpose, by his Spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling; they be justified freely; they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length by God's mercy they attain to everlasting felicity,' &c.

"Lastly, I rashly uttered these words against John Calvin, a man who has the highest claims upon the Church of Christ; namely, that he had dared to exalt himself above the most high and omnipotent Son of the most high and omnipotent God. By which words I confess that I did great injury to a man most learned and truly pious; and I humbly pray that you will all pardon this my rashness. As well also for that I uttered some very bitter expressions against Peter Martyr, Theodore Beza, Jerome Zanchy, Francis Junius, and others of the same views, *the lights and ornaments of* OUR *Church;* calling them by an odious name '*Calvinists,*' and with other words of reproach branding them with the most grievous mark of infamy. *Whom since our Church deservedly reveres,* it was not right that I should injure their character, or in any way lessen their reputation, or dissuade any of the members of our communion from reading their most learned writings.

"Therefore I repent and am ashamed of this most grievous scandal, given publicly by me to this most celebrated University, which is a temple of true religion, a sanctuary of piety; and I promise that by God's help I will never so offend for the future. And I earnestly entreat you, O most accomplished men, and all others whom I have offended either in the preceding points, or in any other part of my aforesaid sermon, that of your humanity you will pardon me on my repentance."*

---

* "Mr. Barret's retractation of some points delivered by him in his Clerum at St. Mary's, anno 1595.

"(MSS. cod. in Biblioth. Coll. Trin. Cantab.)

"Concionanti mihi Latinè ante paucos dies in Academiæ templo (ornatissimi Viri) multa ceciderunt, et falsò et temerè dicta: quibus multorum animos exulceratos intelligo. Ut ergo Ecclesiæ et veritati, quas publicè læsi, satisfaciam, confiteor publicè, et recensendo et revocando, errores meos.

"Primò, Dixi neminem in hoc fragili mundo tanta firmitate esse suffultum, saltem certitudine fidei, *i. e.*, nisi (ut postea exposui) per revelationem, ut de salute sua debeat esse securus. Nunc vero coram Deo profiteor, et

Such was the form drawn up by the Heads of the University as Barret's retractation; and very remarkable evidence it affords us of the received doctrine of our Church in that day.

This retractation was read by Barret; but having been delivered

---

in conscientia mea agnosco, fide justificatos pacem habere erga Deum, *i. e.* reconciliationem cum Deo, et per fidem in illo gratiâ stare. Ergo debere eos de salute sua, fidei ipsius certitudine, certos esse et securos.

Secundò, Petri fidem deficere non potuisse asserui, at aliorum posse. Nam pro fide singulorum (ut tunc dixi) non oravit Dominus. Nunc vero meliori et saniore judicio, dicentis Christi verbis edoctus (Johan. xvii. 20), *Non pro iis*, scil. Apostolis, *rogo tantum, sed et pro iis, qui per sermonem eorum credituri sunt in me*; agnosco pro singulorum fide Christum orâsse; et illius Christi precationis efficacia, ita esse singulos verè credentes suffultos, ut eorum fides nequeat deficere.

Tertiò, Quoad finalem perseverantiam, *superbam* esse dixi illam securitatem de futuro, eoque natura sua contingenti: cujus generis est uniuscujusque hominis perseverantia. Neque tantum *superbam* affirmavi, sed impiissimam. Nunc vero ingenuè profiteor, fidem veram et justificantem, qua fideles arctissimè Christo uniuntur, ita esse fixam, et de futuro etiam certam, ut nunquam possit ullis tentationibus carnis, mundi, aut ipsius diaboli, è fidelium animis radicitus evelli. Adeo ut, qui hanc semel habet, semper sit habiturus. Ejus enim fidei justificantis beneficio, Christus in nobis habitat, et nos in Christo. Ergo non potest non et augeri (Christo in nobis indies crescente) et ad finem usque (quia Deus constantiam largitur) perseverare.

Quartò, In fide nullam esse distinctionem affirmavi, sed in credentibus. Qua in re me errasse fateor. Nunc libenter agnosco, fidem temporariam (quæ ideirco ficta est, teste Bernardo, quia temporaria) non mensura et gradibus sed reipsa distingui, et differri a fide illa salutifera, qua peccatores Christum apprehendentes, coram Deo in æternum justificantur: præterea addo, Jacobum facere mentionem fidei mortuæ, et Paulum, per dilectionem operantis.

Quintò, Subjunxi remissionem peccatorum esse articulum fidei, sed non specialem, nec hujus, nec illius, i. e. (ut ego exposui), nec posse, nec debere quenquam verè fidelem certò credere, peccata sua esse sibi remissa. Jam vero aliter sentio, et ingenuè confiteor, unumquemque verè fidelem, hoc articulo fidei (sc. *Credo remissionem peccatorum*) teneri, certò credere sua ipsius peccata particularia esse sibi gratuitò remissa. Nec tamen hinc sequi petitionem illam orationis Dominicæ (viz. *Remitte nobis debita nostra*) esse supervacaneam. In illa enim petitione petimus fidei tum donum, tum incrementum.

Sextò, Hæc verba mihi in concione exciderunt, viz. Quod ad eos attinet qui non servantur, firmissimè credo, et me sic credere ingenuè profiteor, contra Calvinum, P. Martyrem, et reliquos, peccatum esse veram, propriam et primam causam reprobationis. Sed melius nunc edoctus dico, reprobationem impiorum esse ab æterno, et illud Augustini ad Simplician. esse verissimum, viz., Si peccatum esset causa reprobationis, tum nullus eligeretur, cum præsciat Deus omnes eo contaminatos; et (ut ingenuè agam) non aliter sentio et credo de doctrina electionis et reprobationis, quam Ecclesia Anglicana credit et docet libro de articulis fidei, articulo prædestinationis, in hunc modum: 'Prædestinatio ad vitam est æternum Dei propositum, 'quo ante jacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, 'constanter decrevit, eos, quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, a 'maledicto et exitio liberare, atque (ut vasa in honorem efficta) per

by him so as to imply that it did not express his views, his conduct with respect to it did not give the University satisfaction, and an appeal was made by both parties to the Archbishop, who required the Heads of the University to examine him upon the subject. Now, of the questions put to him in this examination, the 6th was, "Whether God from eternity hath predestinated certain men to life, and reprobated certain? And why?" No doubt the reader who has only heard of Barret as the opponent of Calvinism will expect to find his answer quite opposed to the "Calvinistic" view of the subject. But, on the contrary, what is it? "To the sixth Article," says Strype, "he answered only in these words, *affirmative, et quia voluit.*"* That is, his reply was, as he himself afterwards gave it to the Archbishop, "affirmatively, and because so God would." He traces this predestination and reprobation to God's sovereign will. His replies, however, on other points, were unsatisfactory, both to the Heads of the University and the Archbishop, and the consequence was, he "came to a second examination at Lambeth, before the Archbishop and one or two of the Heads," in which, answering more

---

'Christum ad æternam salutem adducere. Unde qui tam præclaro Dei 'beneficio sunt donati, illi Spiritu ejus, opportuno tempore, operante, 'secundum propositum ejus vocantur; vocationi per gratiam parent; justi-'ficantur gratis; adoptantur in filios Dei; unigeniti ejus filii Jesu Christi 'imagini efficiuntur conformes; in bonis operibus sanctè ambulant; et 'demum ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam felicitatem,' &c.

Postremò, Temerè hæc verba effudi adversus Johannem Calvinum, virum de Ecclesia Christi optimè meritum; eum nimirum ausum fuisse sese attollere supra altissimi et omnipotentis Dei verè altissimum et omnipotentem Filium. Quibus verbis me viro doctissimo vereque pio magnam injuriam fecisse fateor; temeritatemque hanc meam, ut omnes condonetis humillimè precor. Tum etiam quod nonnulla adversus P. Martyrem, Theodorum Bezam, Hieronym. Zanchium, Franciscum Junium, et cæteros ejusdem religionis, *Ecclesiæ nostræ lumina et ornamenta*, acerbissimè effuderim; eos odioso nomine appellans Calvinistas, et aliis verbis ignominiæ gravissimam infamiæ notam inurens. *Quos quia Ecclesia nostra meritò reverebatur*, non erat æquum, ut ego eorum famam violarem, aut existimationem aliqua ratione imminuerem; aut aliquos e nostris dehortarer, ne eorum doctissima scripta legerent.

Hujus igitur gravissimi scandali, a me publicè dati, celeberrimæ huic Academiæ, quæ est veræ religionis templum, pietatis sacrarium, me pœnitet, pigetque, et polliceor me nunquam ita in posterum, Deo dante, delicturum. Et a vobis (ornatissimi Viri) aliisque omnibus, quibus vel in præcedentibus articulis, vel in aliqua alia prædictæ concionis meæ parte, hoc præbui offendiculum, obnixè rogo, ut pro vestra humanitate pœnitenti mihi ignoscatis. (Strype's Whitgift, iii. 317.)

* Strype's Whitgift, book 4. c. 16, p. 453, or, vol. ii. pp. 263, 264.

fully the first question that had been proposed to him, he observes, "I *most firmly believe* that the elect cannot fall away finally."* Consequently, after all, according to modern phraseology he was a decided Calvinist. And if we want a proof of this so-called Calvinism being the universally received doctrine of our Church in the reign of Elizabeth, Barret's case is the one to supply us with it; as shewing that even one who incurred the censures of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the University of Cambridge for his opposition to certain Calvinistic doctrines, yet nevertheless held these points as firmly as the rest.

The truth is, that the points then questioned by him and a few others in our Church, were entirely distinct from these. To go fully into the controversy would occupy too large a space here. But it may be briefly stated, that they related principally to the subjects of reprobation, and assurance of salvation; in the first of which he maintained, "that in the case of those who are not saved, sin is the true, proper, and primary cause of reprobation,"† which was considered an unorthodox statement, both by the Heads and also by the famous Dr. Saravia, (whose judgment the Archbishop requested on the whole matter, and which is given by Strype)‡ although it is admitted by them, that "in the execution of God's decree there is always respect to sin, and the cause of damnation is in the wicked themselves:"§ in the latter, the Archbishop (as he himself states) did not understand him as denying that the faithful might be assured of their salvation by the certainty of faith, but that they were assured by the certainty of such a faith as that with which they believe the omnipotence and unity of the Godhead, &c.‖

The whole controversy clearly shews, that the most thoroughly Calvinistic views of doctrine on all these points were then almost universally held in our Church. For although the Archbishop and the Heads of the University differed a little in some points, yet Barret's statements were considered by both as involving various important errors, and gave rise to what are called the Lambeth Articles, which I shall notice presently.

---

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 457; or, ii. 273.
† Ib. p. 456, or, ii. 270.
‡ Ib. p. 442; or, ii. 241—243, and Appendix.
§ Ib. p. 446; or, ii. 249. ‖ Ib. p. 456, or, ii. 270.

I have already mentioned that the Archbishop applied to Dr. Saravia for his judgment in this matter. The paper he wrote on the subject is given by Strype,* and is well worth the reader's perusal, as the judgment of a learned, able, and moderate man of that period. I will not however detain the reader with it here further than to observe, that on the two points of gratuitous election and predestination, and final perseverance, his testimony is of the strongest kind in defence of the "Calvinistic" view. "That there is no cause," he says, "of election and predestination besides the gratuitous mercy of God, has *always been beyond controversy among all orthodox persons.*"† With respect to reprobation, however, he considered the case to be different, it being the desert of sin. On the question of perseverance he maintains, that to the predestinate such a gift of perseverance is given, as that while without it they would not be able to persevere, with it they *cannot but persevere.*‡ On the other points he moderates with much ability between Barret and the Heads of the University.

I now come to the Lambeth Articles, which are of great importance, as showing us the judgment of the then Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and several of the most eminent divines of that period.

These Articles were drawn up at a meeting at Lambeth in November 1595, at which were present the Archbishop of Canterbury; Dr. Fletcher, Bishop of Bristol, but elect of London; Dr. R. Vaughan, elect of Bangor; Dr. Tyndal, Dean of Ely; Dr. Whitaker, and some other Cambridge divines.§

The Articles are thus given by Strype.

"Articles approved by the Most Reverend Lord, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Richard, Bishop of London, and other divines, at Lambeth, the 20th of November, in the year 1595.

"1. God has from eternity predestinated some to life, and reprobated some to death.

"2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not the prevision of faith, or perseverance, or good works, or anything

* Whitgift's Life, App. book 4, No. 24.
† Strype's Whitgift, App. to book 4, No. 24, p. 195; or iii. 331.
‡ Ib. p. 194, or iii. 330.
§ Heylin's Quinquart. Hist. Part 3, c. 20.

which exists in the persons predestinated, but the sole pleasure of the goodwill of God.

"3. The number of the predestinated is foreordained and certain, and can neither be increased nor diminished.

"4. They who are not predestinated to salvation will necessarily be condemned on account of their sins.

"5. True, living, justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God, is not extinguished, does not fail, is not lost in the elect, either finally or totally.

"6. A man truly faithful, that is, endued with justifying faith, is certain, with the full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and his eternal salvation through Christ.

"7. Saving grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to all men, by which they may be saved, if they will.

"8. No one can come to Christ, except it shall have been given him to do so, and unless the Father shall have drawn him. And all men are not drawn by the Father so as to come to the Son.

"9. It is not placed in the will or power of every man to be saved."*

These propositions the Archbishop of Canterbury sent to Dr. Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York, who had been Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge from 1562 to 1567, (when

---

* Articuli approbati a Reverendiss. Dom. D. D. Joanne Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi et Richardo Episcopo Londinensi et aliis Theologis, Lambethæ. Novembris 20, anno 1595.

1. Deus ab æterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit.

2. Causa movens aut efficiens prædestinationis ad vitam non est prævisio fidei, aut perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei, quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Dei.

3. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus numerus est, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.

4. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem necessario propter peccata sua damnabuntur.

5. Vera, viva, justificans fides, et Spiritus Dei sanctificans, non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit in electis, aut finaliter aut totaliter.

6. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est plerophoria fidei de remissione peccatorum suorum et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.

7. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur, non conceditur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si voluerint.

8. Nemo potest venire ad Christum, nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit. Et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre, ut veniant ad Filium.

9. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis servari. (Strype's Whitgift, book 4, c. 17, p. 461; or ii. 280.)

he was succeeded by Whitgift himself) for his judgment; which he gave in favour of each *seriatim*. "And then," says Strype,

"He subscribed his name after these words, *Hæ theses ex sacris literis vel aperte colligi vel necessaria consecutione deduci possunt; et ex scriptis Augustini. Matth. Ebor.*"*

These propositions the Archbishop of Canterbury sent to Cambridge with a letter to the Heads, "praying them to *take care that nothing should be publicly taught to the contrary;*" adding, however, "that the propositions nevertheless must so be taken and used as their private judgments; thinking them to be true and correspondent to the doctrine *professed in the Church of England, and established by the laws of the land;* and not as laws and decrees." †

And in a paper drawn up, as Strype supposes, "for the information of some great men" as to this whole affair of Barret, the Archbishop says of these propositions,—

"I know them to be sound doctrines and *uniformly professed in this Church of England, and agreeable to the Articles of religion established by authority.* And therefore I thought it meet that Barret should in more humble sort confess his ignorance and error: and that none should be suffered to teach any contrary doctrine to the foresaid propositions agreed upon. And this is the sum of all this action. And if this agreement be not maintained, further contentions will grow, to the animating the common adversaries, the Papists: by whose practice Barret and others are set on. Some of his opinions being indeed Popish."‡

From these propositions, then, it clearly appears what was the view then entertained in the highest places of the Church, as to the doctrine of the Church of England. The value and force of the testimony I leave the reader to appreciate. He may also, I suppose, easily determine the question, whether in the face of these proceedings within a few years of the establishment of our standards of doctrine, and of the affirmations here made of such doctrine having been *the uniform doctrine* of our Church, it can be maintained, not merely that these propositions go *beyond* the

---

* Strype's Whitgift, book 4, c. 17, p. 461, or ii. 280; and see also his confirmation of this opinion, ib. p. 478; or ii. 314.

† Ib.

‡ Ib. c. 16, p. 459; or ii. 277.

express statements of our Articles (which is a totally different question), but that the statements of the two are *opposed* to each other.

It was not likely, however, that such explicit statements of doctrine should be received with universal satisfaction; and, moreover, the very circumstance of their being put forth without the royal sanction excited the jealousy of the Queen. It appears from a letter of the Archbishop to the Heads, that the Queen, though "*persuaded of the truth of the propositions*," "did think it to be utterly unfit that the same should anyways be publicly dealt with either in sermons or disputations," and supposed that they had been sent to the University for this purpose.* And she was still *more angry with Baro*, the Margaret Professor of Divinity, for publicly maintaining *doctrine which appeared contrary to some of the propositions*.†

And, as I have observed, it was not to be expected that the statements of these propositions should meet with universal assent. Accordingly we find, that though they met with no direct and open opposition, the authority which promulgated them being sufficient to prevent that, they were secretly disliked by many; who took the course, too common in such cases, of professing to receive them, while they explained away their meaning.

The leader of the dissentients was Baro, the Margaret Professor of Divinity, who was several times convened before the Heads, and charged with opposing the doctrine contained in these Articles, and maintaining various errors. These errors were what would now be called Arminianism.‡ The charge of opposing the doctrine maintained in the Lambeth Articles, he denied; but nevertheless, after a careful examination of his judgment of those Articles sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury at his request, I must confess that I cannot consider him as a maintainer of the doctrine contained in them; and I am not surprised that the Archbishop of York, when asked by the Archbishop of Canterbury for his judgment respecting him, "in his answer showed how little he liked of him and his learning,

* Ib. b. 4. c. 17. p. 463; or ii. 284. † Ib. p. 465; or ii. 287, 288.
‡ Ib. book 4, cc. 17 and 18.

wishing that he were in his own country, and not *to disturb the peace of our Church.*"* His conduct seems to me to have been what we should now call very Tractarian, that is, thoroughly disingenuous; and in the following year he resigned his Professorship and retired from Cambridge.† His "orthodox explication," as he called it, of the Lambeth Articles, is given by Strype,‡ and was, I think, clearly intended to strain them in what would now be called an "Arminian" *direction.*

Of course, however, when we consider the way in which his case was taken up, and his being obliged in consequence to retire from Cambridge, his example is anything but a proof that his doctrine is that of our Church, but much the contrary. In fact, the remark made by Heylin himself when noticing this case, shows this. "Such," he says, "was the condition of affairs at Cambridge at the expiring of the year 1595, the genuine doctrine of the Church BEGINNING then to break through the clouds of *Calvinism,* wherewith it was *before obscured,* and to shine forth again in its former lustre."§ It is here admitted that the Anti-Calvinistic doctrine *began* to show itself publicly in our Church in 1595; and the insinuations that it is "the genuine doctrine of our Church," and began then to shine forth "in its *former* lustre," are mere groundless assertions made to mislead the reader; because it is not pretended that this "genuine doctrine" had made its appearance publicly in any former period of Queen Elizabeth's reign; that is, at any time since the present Formularies of our Church were established. From the period of their establishment, at the commencement of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to the year 1595, the doctrine now called Calvinism, on the points of election, predestination, and final perseverance, was the almost universal doctrine of our divines, and consequently is, of necessity, most in accordance with those Formularies; unless we suppose, that the very men who established them, voluntarily made them such as they could not themselves conscientiously subscribe.

---

* Ib. p. 476; or ii. 309. See also a Letter of the Heads to their Chancellor, Strype's Annals, Records, No. 160.

† Strype's Annals, ii. 1. 568, book 1, c. 35.

‡ Strype's Whitgift, App. book 4, No. 26.

§ Quinquart. Hist. Pt. 3, c. 22, § 6.

I must observe, however, before I pass on, that even Baro appears to have held the doctrine of final perseverance, so far as Augustine's view of it extended; for, in his remarks on the fifth Article of Lambeth, he says, after maintaining that justifying faith is sometimes lost, "Nevertheless in the elect, as this Article rightly teaches, it is not finally lost. Nay further, when in these very elect the whole is sometimes lost, yet in a sense it may be said that it is not totally lost; that is, it is not so lost in the elect, but that it is afterwards restored through penitence."* And it is admitted by Heylin, when *compelled to confess that Overall was of this opinion*, that several others whom he would fain have been able to range on his own side, took this view. "Nor can it be denied," he says, to use his own peculiar phraseology, but "that some other learned men of those times were of the same opinion also."† The question which one would have been glad to ask him is, *what* learned men of those times in our Church were *not* of that opinion?

The views of Baro were very probably participated in, to a certain extent, by several others; but Strype mentions only the names of Overall, Clayton, Harsnet, and Andrews.‡ And I can find no others added even by Heylin as taking his part at that time.

What Dr. Clayton's particular views were, or how far he agreed with Baro, I cannot find; there not being, as far as I am aware, any record of his judgment upon the points in question.

The views of Harsnet, who was afterwards promoted to the Episcopal Bench, and ultimately in the times of Charles I. became Archbishop of York, may be judged of by a sermon originally preached by him in 1584, but not published till 1656,§ many years after his death, which took place in 1631. From this sermon, (the delay in the publication of which is somewhat remarkable), it would appear that his views were what we should

---

* In electis tamen, ut recte docet hic articulus, non amittitur finaliter. Imo quando in his ipsis electis scil. tota interdum amittitur, aliquo tamen sensu dici potest non amitti totaliter: id est, non amitti in electis, quin per pœnitentiam postea restauretur.

† Quinq. Hist. Pt. 3, c. 22, § 6.

‡ Life of Whitgift, book 4, c. 18, p. 473; or ii. 303.

§ Three Sermons by Dr. R. Stuart, to which is added a fourth by the Right Rev. S. Harsnet, &c. Lond. 1656, 12mo., 2nd ed. 1658, 12mo.

now call Arminian. But I suppose the mere fact that such a sermon was preached, especially considering that it was never published till 1656, can hardly be considered of much weight.

The views of Andrews, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, may be best gathered from his judgment on the Lambeth Articles. They are propounded with much wisdom, learning, and moderation. And I cannot refrain from quoting, for the benefit of over zealous spirits on *both* sides, his opening remarks in giving his judgment.

"The first four Articles are about Predestination and Reprobation; of which the one is called by the Apostle, 'O the depth [of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God'], the other by the prophet 'a great deep,' Rom. xi. 33, Psal. xxxvi. 6. I indeed frankly confess, I have followed Augustine's advice,—these mysteries which I cannot unfold I have viewed with admiration as they lie concealed; and hence that for these sixteen years, ever since I was made priest, I have neither publicly nor privately disputed about them, or written a sermon on them; and that now I had rather hear than speak concerning them. And indeed, since the topic is one in which the danger of falling is great, and which has on both sides dangerous precipices, and since the passages from St. Paul's writings, from whence the doctrine is commonly drawn, are always held to be among those things hard to be understood (of which Peter speaks); and since there are not many among the clergy who are able wisely and cleverly to explain and unravel these things, and very few of the people that are fit and competent hearers of the matter, I should advise, if it could be done, that silence should be enjoined on both sides, and that these things should not be so indiscriminately and crudely set forth by every body as they are wont to be."*

The judgment he gives upon the statements of the Articles,

---

* Quatuor priores articuli de prædestinatione sunt et reprobatione; quarum illa ab apostolo dicitur, Ω *βαθος*, hæc a propheta, abyssus multa, Rom. xi. 33, Psal. xxxvi. 6. Ego certe ingenue fateor, sequutus sum Augustini consilium, mysteria hæc quæ aperire non possum, clausa miratus sum, et proinde, per hos 16 annos, ex quo presbyter sum factus, me neque publice neque privatim vel disputasse de eis, vel pro concione tractasse; etiam nunc quoque malle de eis audire quam dicere. Et quidem cum lubricus locus sit, et habeat *utrinque* periculosa præcipitia, cumque loci Paulini, unde fere eruitur, inter *δυσνοητα* illa (de quibus Petrus) semper sint habiti, cumque nec multi in clero sint, qui ea dextre expedire, et perpauci in populo qui idonei illius auditores esse possint, suaderem, si fieri posset, ut indiceretur utrinque silentium, nec ita passim et crude proponerentur a quibusque ut assolet," &c.

however, though very cautious and temperate, and not quite so clear as could have been desired, seems to me clearly to show that his views had what we should now call an Arminian bias, except as to the doctrine of *final perseverance*, which he *distinctly maintains* in his remarks on the fifth Article, which are as follows,—

"Certainly no one, I believe, ever said, That faith finally fails in the elect. It certainly does not fail. But that it does not fail is, I think, owing to the nature of its subject, not its own; from the privilege of the person, not of the thing. And this on account of apostates, who ought not to be charged with falling from faith, their faith never having been true and lively. But whether the Holy Spirit may for a time be taken away or extinguished, is, I think, yet a question. I confess that I am in doubt on the subject."*

He then adduces some passages of Scripture to prove the affirmative of this last question, and finally adds,—

"Although I am aware that this very phrase, *that faith cannot be totally lost*, may be thus explained; that although the whole of it may be lost, it cannot be lost wholly for good or irrecoverably, that is, so lost that there is no opportunity for men to return whence they fell."†

There remains for consideration the case of Overall, afterwards Dean of St. Paul's and Bishop of Norwich. But this is one of a different kind, and one which will repay the trouble of investigation. Although there were some points in which he agreed with Baro, and that he did not altogether hold with the Lambeth Articles, yet he did not agree with the Arminian doctrine. His views in fact were somewhat peculiar, and took a middle course between the Calvinistic and Arminian views on the subject; and although it cannot be conceded that they were precisely the

---

* Certe nemo unquam dixerit, credo, Fidem in electis finaliter excidere. Illa vero non excidit. Sed quod non excidat, hoc habere existimo a natura subjecti sui, non sua; ex privilegio personæ, non rei. Atque hoc propter apostatas, quibus vitio dari non debet, quod excidant a fide, quæ *vera et viva nunquam fuit*. An vero Spiritus Sanctus ad tempus auferri aut extingui possit, existimo quæri adhuc posse; fateor hærere me.

† Etsi non sum nescius, et hoc ipsum, *non posse amitti totaliter*, exponi posse sic, ut *in totum* prorsus vel *penitus* amitti nequeat, esti *tota* amittatur, id est, ita amitti, ut non sit locus revertendi, unde exciderunt. (Hist. Artic. Lambeth, ad finem Ford. in Art. 39, pp 425 et seq.)

views held by the Reformers of our Church when drawing up the Articles, yet they may be admitted to be fairly included in the intentionally comprehensive phraseology of our Articles. To my mind they are well worth consideration.

His opinion upon the points to which I am here more expressly referring, was given in connection with the famous Quinquarticular controversy that arose early in the 17th century in Belgium, and led to the Synod of Dort, in which he took a middle view of the points in question between the two parties.

His judgment on this controversy (which has been referred to and quoted by Bishop Davenant in his Answer to Hoard, and largely by Bishop Hall in his Via Media), has never been published*, but their quotations have enabled me to identify it in two MSS. in the Harleian Collection in the British Museum; in one of which (I may add), though it occurs anonymously, it is placed in juxtaposition with several acknowledged pieces of Overall. Not having been published, I shall present the reader with the whole of it as it there stands.

"There are five Articles controverted in Belgium.

"1. Concerning the Divine Predestination.

"2. Concerning the Death of Christ.

"3. Concerning Free Will and Grace.

"4. Concerning the mode of the operation of Divine grace.

"5. Concerning the perseverance of believers.

"Respecting which the Remonstrants or Arminians, and the Contra-remonstrants or Puritans, defend opposite tenets; between which our Church much more correctly (as it appears to me) holds the middle path.

"1. Concerning the Divine predestination.

First, the Remonstrants maintain a general Decree of predestination, and conditional upon faith, according to the general Evangelical promise of the salvation of all men on account of Christ having

* A statement of the doctrine of our Church on the five Articles involved in this controversy, attributed to Overall, has often been published in the "Historia Artic. Lambeth." annexed to Ellis's "Defens. Artic." and Ford's "Comment. in Artic. 1720," 8vo.; but I cannot find the authority for calling him the author of it; although it may very possibly have been written by him, as it seems to accord with his general views. It was first published, I believe, at the end of Bishop Davenant's "Dissertationes duæ de morte Christi et de prædestinatione. Cant. 1650," fol., where it is attributed to Davenant, but certainly by mistake.

died for them, if through the word and the Holy Spirit aiding it they believe in him with a lively and persevering faith.

"[The Remonstrants maintain] secondly, a special and absolute Decree, arising from the foreknowledge of faith, respecting the salvation of those men in particular of whom God foresaw that they would through grace believe; and on the other hand the damnation of those of whom He foresaw that they would remain in sin impenitent and unbelieving. And this is the judgment of the ancient Fathers, before Augustine, and of many after him, of many also of the Papists, the Lutherans, and many others.

"In the second place, the Contra-remonstrants, excluding a general and conditional Decree, maintain an exclusive particular and absolute Decree respecting certain individuals selected out of the human race to have faith and perseverance bestowed upon them, and to be saved, for the sake of the death of Christ, suffered for them only, through the efficacious and irresistible grace of the Holy Spirit, enjoyed by them alone; all the rest being rejected and condemned by an absolute Decree. And this is the view of Zuingle, Calvin, and the Puritans, unknown to all the ancient Fathers, even to Augustine and his followers, rejected by most of [one MS. reads, *all*] the Papists, all the Lutherans, and many others."

[I doubt whether some of the parties here mentioned would have allowed this to be a fair statement of their views.]

"In the third place, our Church, holding a middle path, JOINS *a particular absolute Decree, not arising from the foreknowledge of human faith or will, but from the purpose of the Divine will and grace, respecting the liberation and salvation of those whom God hath chosen in Christ*, with a general and conditional will, or a general Evangelical promise; teaching that the Divine promises are so to be embraced by us as they are generally set forth in the Holy Scriptures, and that that will of God is to be followed by us which we have clearly revealed in the word; namely, that God gave his Son for the world or the whole human race; that Christ offered himself a sacrifice for all the sins of the whole world; that Christ redeemed the whole human race; that Christ ordered the Gospel to be preached to all; that God wills and commands all to hear Christ, and believe in him, and that he has set forth grace and salvation for all in him; and that this is an infallible truth in which there can be no error. Otherwise that the Apostles and other ministers of the Gospel preaching this are false witnesses of God and make God a liar, &c.; and this opinion agrees with the opinion of Augustine, as it is explained by Prosper and Fulgentius. It is the more common opinion of the Church since Augustine. And these two things agree

very well together, that God in the first place proposed salvation in Christ to all, if they believed, and common and sufficient grace, in the means divinely ordained, if men were not wanting to the word of God and the Holy Spirit: Then, secondly, that He might help human infirmity, and that the salvation of men might be more certain, that he thought good to *add a special grace, more efficacious and abundant, to be communicated to whom He pleased, by which not only they might be able to believe or obey, if so inclined, but also actually be inclined, believe, obey and persevere,* according to the saying of Augustine, The God and Lord of all has so ordered the life of angels and men, that in it he might first show what their free will could do, then what the blessing of his grace and the communication of righteousness could do.

"2. Concerning the Death of Christ.

"In like manner concerning the death of Christ undergone for men, there are three opinions.

"The first, that Christ died for all men, and by his death redeemed the whole human race, with a general and conditional intention on the part of God of giving salvation to all for the sake of Christ's death, on the condition of faith dependent on the free co-operation of men under grace.

"The second, contrary to the first, that Christ did not die for all men, &c., and did not redeem the whole human race, &c., and that God did not in any way or under any condition purpose or intend to give salvation or grace for the sake of Christ to any others than to the elect alone.

"The third, while it grants the death of Christ for all men, and the conditional intention of God respecting the general grace of the Evangelical promise, adds *the special intention of God concerning the application of the benefit of the death of Christ, through more abundant and efficacious grace, absolutely, certainly, and infallibly, to the elect alone,* without any prejudice to others, or any diminution of will and common and sufficient grace in the case of others.

"3. Concerning Free Will and Grace.

"Concerning Free Will and Grace, all agree that the Free Will can do nothing good without grace prævenient, accompanying, and following after, so that grace may hold the beginning, the middle, and the end, both in conversion, and faith, and every good work. But they differ in this, that—The first opinion lays it down, that influential grace is so joined with the word heard, understood, and meditated upon, that to all willing to do that, it is in some degree common. The second maintains that grace is proper and peculiar to the elect alone, and does not admit that it is in any way common to all. The

third joins together both kinds of grace, so acknowledging a common and sufficient grace connected with the word, as to maintain also a special and efficacious grace, leading with certainty to salvation, *peculiar to those whom God has chosen in Christ of his own gracious good pleasure.*

"4. On the mode of the operation of Divine Grace.

"The first opinion lays it down, that grace so works in man, as not to take away the liberty of the human will, but to preserve it; that man is so enabled by grace to believe and obey, as that he is able also by his free will to resist grace.

"The second opinion maintains the irresistible operation of grace, so that wherever it is, it unalterably inclines and leads the mind to assent and obedience.

"The third teaches that men are so influenced and moved by grace, that they both can follow the grace that calls and moves, if they apply themselves to it, and also can resist the Divine call and influence by their Free Will, and too often do resist; but it adds, *that God, when he wills, and to whom he wills, gives grace so abundant, powerful, or suitable, or in some other way efficacious, that although the will is able to resist it, on account of its liberty, yet it does not resist, but certainly and infallibly complies; and that God so acts with those whom he has chosen in Christ, so far as is necessary for their salvation.*

"5. Concerning the perseverance of believers.

"The first opinion maintains, that all believers are so aided by Divine grace, that they are able to persevere, if they are disposed to apply proper care, and that they can also by negligence and security fall from faith and grace.

"The second maintains, that no believers can so fall from faith and Divine grace as to fall back into the state of damnation, or perish; but that those who have once believed, always so persevere in faith and grace, that at length they all reach salvation.

"The third maintains, with Augustine, that believers may, through the infirmity of the flesh and temptations, go back from grace and faith, or even fall from them. But it adds, *that those believers who are called according to God's purpose, and who are firmly grounded in a lively faith, cannot either totally or finally fall or perish, but, by a special and efficacious grace, so persevere in a true and lively faith, that at length they are brought to eternal life.*"*

---

* MS. Harl. in Mus. Brit., No. 3142, pp. 1-3 et No. 750, fol. 87, 88. [I have given, within hooks, the various readings of MS. 750.]

Quinque sunt Articuli in Belgio controversi:—

1. De praedestinatione divina.
2. De morte Christi.
3. De [illegible]

Such were the views of Overall, which most men in the present day would call Calvinistic, and which appear to me to run exceedingly near to those of Calvin and his more moderate and judicious adherents, though guarding against the

4. De modo operationis gratiæ divinæ.
5. De perseverantia credentium.

De quibus Remonstrantes sive Arminiani, et contra-Remonstrantes sive Puritani, contrarias sententias tuentur: inter quas Ecclesia nostra multo rectius (ut mihi videtur) mediam viam tenet.

1. De prædestinatione divina.

Primo, Remonstrantes ponunt prædestinationis decretum generale et conditionatum sub conditione fidei, secundum generalem promissionem Evangelicam de servandis omnibus hominibus propter Christum pro iis mortuum, si in eum per verbum et Spiritum Sanctum eidem assistentem fide viva et perseverante crediderint.

Secundo, speciale et absolutum ex præscientia fidei de servandis iis singularibus hominibus quos prævidit Deus per gratiam credituros; contraque iis damnandis quos prævidit in peccato impœnitentes et incredentes [incredulos, MS. 750.] mansuros. Et hæc est sententia veterum patrum, ante Augustinum, multorumque post illum, ex Pontificiis multorum, Lutheranorum, et multorum aliorum.

Secundo [secunda sententia, MS. 750.] contra-Remonstrantes, exclusa decreto generali et conditionato, unicum [MS. 750 *omits* unicum] ponunt decretum particulare et absolutum, de certis quibusdam singularibus hominibus ex humano genere selectis, propter Christum pro iis solis mortuum, per Spiritus Sancti [750 *omits* Sancti] gratiam efficacem seu irresistibilem iisque peculiarem, fide et perseverantia donandis et servandis [750 *omits* et servandis], reliquis omnibus absoluto decreto rejectis et damnandis. Et hæc est sententia Zuinglii, Calvini, et Puritanorum, ignota omnibus antiquis patribus, etiam Augustino et ejus sectatoribus, rejecta a plerisque [ab omnibus *for* a plerisque, 750.] Pontificiis, Lutheranis omnibus [750 *omits* omnibus], multisque aliis.

Tertio, [tertia sententia, MS. 750.] nostra Ecclesia mediam viam tenens, [insistens *for* tenens, 750] conjungit particulare decretum absolutum, non ex præscientia humanæ fidei aut voluntatis, sed ex proposito divinæ voluntatis et gratiæ, de his quos Deus elegit in Christo liberandis et salvandis, cum generali et conditionata voluntate, seu generali promissione Evangelica, docens promissiones divinas sic amplectendas esse, ut nobis in sacris Literis generaliter [750 *omits* generaliter] propositæ sunt, eamque Dei voluntatem nobis sequendam esse, quam habemus in verbo diserte revelatam, videlicet, Deum dedisse filium pro mundo sive toto genere humano; Christum obtulisse se sacrificium pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi: Christum redemisse totum [omne *for* totum, 750] genus humanum; Christum mandasse omnibus Evangelium prædicandum; Deum velle et jubere ut omnes Christum audiant, et in eum credant, in eoque proposuisse gratiam et salutem omnibus; esseque hanc veritatem infallibilem cui non possit [potest *for* possit, 750] subesse falsum. Alioqui Apostolos aliosque ministros Evangelii hoc [hæc *for* hoc, 750] prædicantes esse falsos testes Dei, facereque Deum mendacem, &c.; et hæc sententia congruit cum sententia Augustini, prout à Prospero et Fulgentio explicatur. [Et hæc videtur esse sententia Franc. Sales, lib. 4° De Amore Dei. cap. 1°. par. 1. *Not. marg.*] Est Ecclesiæ sententia magis communis post Augustinum. Et hæc duo bene conveniunt, Deum primo loco proposuisse

extremes to which his system was carried by numbers even in our own Church. The chief difference seems to me to lie in Overall's view of the doctrine of final perseverance, which supposes, that men having true faith, and therefore regenerate, may

---

salutem in Christo omnibus [hominibus, 750] si crediderint, gratiamque communem et sufficientem, in mediis divinitus ordinatis, si homines verbo Dei Spiritaique Sancto deesse noluerint. Deinde secundo loco ut succurreret humanæ infirmitati, certiorque salus [hominum, 750] esset, voluisse addere specialem gratiam, magis efficacem et abundantem, quibus placuerit communicandam, per quam non solum possint credere, aut obedire si velint, sed etiam actu velint, credant, obediant ac perseverent, juxta sententiam Augustini. Sic Deus Dominusque omnium ordinavit angelorum hominumque vitam, ut in ea primum ostenderet quid posset eorum liberum arbitrium, deinde quid posset suæ gratiæ beneficium, justitiæque judicium.

2. De Morte Christi.

Similiter de morte Christi pro hominibus [omnibus *for* hominibus, 750] obita, tres sunt sententiæ.

Prima, Christum mortuum esse pro omnibus hominibus, et per mortem suam redemisse totum genus humanum, cum intentione Dei generali et conditionata, de danda propter Christum mortuum salute omnibus, sub conditione fidei dependente ex libera eo operatione hominum sub gratia.

Secunda primæ contraria, Christum non esse mortuum pro hominibus [750 *omits* hominibus] omnibus, &c., nec redemisse totum genus humanum, &c., nec Deum ullo modo aut conditione velle aut intendere dare salutem aut gratiam propter Christum aliis quam solis [750 *omits* solis] electis.

Tertia, supposita morte Christi pro omnibus hominibus, et intentione Dei conditionata de gratia promissionis Evangelicæ generali, addit intentionem Dei specialem, de applicando beneficio mortis Christi per gratiam magis abundantem et efficacem, absolute, certo, et infallibiliter solis electis, sine ullo præjudicio, aut ulla voluntatis et gratiæ communis et sufficientis diminutione.

3. De libero Arbitrio et Gratia.

De libero Arbitrio et Gratia omnes consentiunt liberum arbitrium nihil boni posse sine gratia præveniente, comitante, [750 *omits* comitante] et subsequente, ita ut gratia teneat principium, medium, et finem et [in *for* et, 750] conversione et fide et omni opere bono. Sed differunt in eo quod— Prima sententia statuit [statuat *for* statuit, 750] gratiam excitantem [750 *omits* gratiam excitantem] sic cum verbo audito intellecto et cogitato conjunctam esse [gratiam, 750], ut omnibus id [750 *omits* id] facere volentibus sit in aliquo [quodam *for* aliquo, 750] gradu communis. Secunda, gratiam solis electis propriam et peculiarem esse contendunt [*contendat* for *contendunt*, 750], nec illam omnibus communem aliquo [ullo *for* aliquo, 750] modo fateatur. Tertia utramque gratiam conjungit, sic communem et sufficientem cum verbo connexam agnoscens, ut specialem et efficacem, ad salutem certo perducentem, his quos Deus in Christo ex beneplacito suo gratioso elegerit propriam profiteatur.

4. De modo operationis Gratiæ divinæ.

Prima sententia ponit, gratiam sic in homine operari, ut libertatem voluntatis humanæ non tollat, sed conservet; ita posse hominem per gratiam credere et obedire ut possit etiam per liberum arbitrium gratiæ resistere.

Secunda sententia [ponit, 750] operationem irresistibilem gratiæ [750

finally and entirely fall away; though not the elect, who are called according to God's purpose, and on whom the gift of final perseverance is bestowed. At the same time, his words just quoted seem to imply the consciousness of a distinction between the nature of the faith that fails, and that of the elect, which would make the difference not very great; for that there is a species of faith from which men may fall away, all admit.

And here it is of importance to notice a passage in the Hampton Court Conference, which has often been strangely misrepresented in modern times, in a sense the very reverse of the truth. In that Conference the Puritans expressed a wish that in Art. 16, after the words, "After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace," the following words should be added, "Yet neither totally nor finally."* The Bishops opposed the introduction of these words. The fact, nakedly stated, has been quite sufficient for our modern theologians to ground upon it the assertion, that in the Hampton Court Conference the Bishops maintained that the doctrine of final perseverance was not the doctrine of our Church. And far and wide has the assertion been made, and found its way even into Examination

---

transposes the two last words], ita ut ubicunque fuerit, mentem ad assentiendum et obediendum immutabiliter flectat et perducat.

Tertia docet homines sic a gratia excitari et moveri, ut et possint gratiæ vocanti et moventi, si attenderint, obsequi, et possint etiam divinæ vocationi et motioni per liberum arbitrium resistere, et nimium sæpe resistunt; sed addit, Deum, cum voluerit, et quibus voluerit, gratiam tam abundantem, aut potentem, aut congruam, aut alio modo efficacem, concedere, et [ut, 750] quamvis possit voluntas ratione suæ libertatis resistere, non tamen resistat, sed certo et infallibiliter obsequatur, et ita Deum agere cum his quos elegit in Christo, quatenus ad eorum salutem necessarium est.

5. De perseverantia credentium.

Prima sententia ponit, omnes credentes sic instructos esse divina gratia, ut possint perseverare, si debitam curam adhibere voluerint, posse etiam eosdem per negligentiam et securitatem a fide et gratia deficere.

Secunda ponit, nullos credentes posse a fide et gratia divina ita deficere ut in statum damnationis recidant [accidant *for* recidant, 750] aut pereant, sed qui semel crediderint, ita semper in fide et gratia perseverare, ut tandem omnes ad salutem [certo, 750] perveniant.

Tertia ponit, cum Augustino, credentes posse a gratia et fide per carnis infirmitatem et tentationes recedere, aut etiam deficere. Sed addit, illos credentes qui secundum propositum vocati sunt, quique in fide viva solide radicati sunt, non posse aut totaliter aut finaliter deficere aut perire, sed per gratiam specialem et efficacem ita in fide vera et viva perseverare, ut tandem ad vitam æternam perducantur.

* See "Account of Hampton Court Conference," reprinted in the "Phœnix," vol. i. p. 149.

papers for young theological students. Now it really might have been expected, that the authorized printed account of the Conference (drawn up by Bishop Barlow) should have been *read*. And then it would have been found, that the fact is just the reverse of what has been stated. There were circumstances in the state of the Church at that time that seemed to render it inexpedient to make the addition proposed, as the Bishop of London stated on the occasion.* But the Bishop's language shows that he did not think of denying the truth of the doctrine involved in the words; and the remarks of Overall (then Dean of St. Paul's, and afterwards Bishop of Norwich) are so *expressly* in favour of the Augustinian doctrine at least on the subject, that it is astonishing how any one could overlook them. The following is the report given of them.

"Upon this the Dean of St. Paul's kneeling down, humbly desired leave to speak, signifying unto his Majesty, that this matter somewhat more nearly concerned him, by reason of controversy between him and some other in Cambridge, upon a proposition which he had delivered there; namely, that whosoever (although before justified) did commit any grievous sin, as adultery, murder, treason, or the like, did become, *ipso facto*, subject to God's wrath, and guilty of damnation, or were in a state of damnation (*quoad præsentem statum*) until they repented; ADDING HERETO, *that those which were called and justified according to the purpose of God's election, however they might, and did, sometime fall into grievous sins, and thereby into the present state of wrath and damnation; yet did never fall, either totally from all the graces of God, to be utterly destitute of all the parts and seed thereof, nor finally from justification, but were in time renewed, by God's Spirit, unto a lively faith and repentance;* and so justified from those sins, and the wrath, curse, and guilt annexed thereunto, whereinto they are fallen, and wherein they lay, so long as they were without true repentance for the same."†

Such is Overall's own statement. What he objected to was, that it should be maintained, that men, while in a state of unrepented sin, are still at that very time in the "state of justification;" while nevertheless he himself held, that none that are "called and justified according to the purpose of God's

* [illegible]

† Ib. pp. 155, 156.

election" ever fall "either totally from all the graces of God," or "finally from justification." The distinction apparently drawn here, between "justification," and "justification according to the purpose of God's election," seems to me quite unauthorized by Scripture.

The difference, then, between the view of Overall (following Augustine) and that of the great body of our Reformation divines, on the doctrine of final perseverance, was only this, that the latter held that those once made members of Christ, and partakers of true faith and repentance, never fall away, while the former held that some to whom these blessings are vouchsafed do fall away, but that to certain individuals, elected by God to salvation, God of his free mercy vouchsafes to superadd a measure of grace that ensures perseverance.

In what way Augustine's doctrine smooths the difficulties of the subject, I cannot understand. It appears to me that the doctrine—that spiritual regeneration, and its accompanying gifts and graces, are generally given, but that none but those upon whom the gift of final perseverance is bestowed will be saved, and that that gift is bestowed only upon the elect,—is equally difficult of reception with the doctrine that spiritual regeneration and its accompanying blessings are given only to the elect, and that those to whom they are given have also the gift of final perseverance. The exclusion of those who are not among the elect is as complete on the former system as on the latter;* and the only difference between the two systems is as to the amount of spiritual gifts bestowed upon those whom God has not appointed to salvation. This seems to me a question of no very material moment; and of the two systems the latter surely has the fewer difficulties; and much might be quoted from the latter treatises of Augustine, written after his views had somewhat changed, which seems to favor such a system much more than that which his earlier works seem to support. But Augustine no doubt speaks of all baptized in infancy as spiritually regenerated, and hence our modern "High Churchmen" are fond of quoting his authority for the word. Let them,

* This certainly was Augustine's view, and apparently Overall's. The latter has not indeed *absolutely* stated, that *none* of those who have only ordinary grace use it so as to obtain salvation; but his words strongly imply that such is the case.

however, but take his doctrine with it, and they will feel that his writings are not likely to advance their cause.

It is very important, however, in our present subject, to notice this difference of view, because those who confound the Predestinarian system that prevailed among the Reformed with that of Augustine, suppose that that system had no bearing upon the views of the Reformers as to the effects of Baptism; whereas in truth it had a very material influence upon them. Our Reformers, as a body, held that the elect only are made partakers of those spiritual gifts that are essential to regeneration, and that final perseverance was always connected with those gifts. I am not, of course, denying that some among the Reformers themselves may have held precisely St. Augustine's view; but the evidence already adduced shows that the prevalent opinion was in favor of what is *now* commonly called the *Calvinistic* view; a name attached to it by Romanists and its opponents among Protestants, in order to throw discredit upon it, but which our early divines would have called the Scriptural doctrine on the subject.

To this brief summary of some of the principal evidences as to the received doctrine of our Church in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and the early part of that of her successor, it would be easy to add largely; and I ought not to forget to direct the attention of the reader to the fact, that four representatives of our Church were sent by public authority to the Synod of Dort in 1619, and gave their unanimous testimony, as such representatives, in favour of the system of doctrine there agreed to.

The principal of these representatives was the learned Bishop Carleton, who, in his controversy with Mountagu in 1626, thus bears testimony to the nature of the doctrine of our Church.

"The Church of England was reformed by the help of our learned and reverend Bishops in the days of King Edward the Sixth, and in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. *They who then gave that form of reformation to our Church held consent in doctrine with Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer*, being by authority appointed readers in the two Universities. . . . For that these worthy Bishops who were in the first reformation had this respect unto P. Martyr and M. Bucer, it is apparent, both because the doctrine of our Church doth not differ from the doctrine that these taught, and because that worthy Archbishop Cranmer caused our Liturgy to be translated into Latin, and craved the consent and judgment of M. Bucer, who gave a full consent thereto, as it appeareth in his works, *Inter Opera*

Anglicana. And P. Martyr being likewise requested, writeth in his Epistles touching that matter, his judgment and consent of the government and discipline of our Church. This uniformity of doctrine was held in our Church without disturbance, as long as those worthy Bishops lived who were employed in the Reformation. For albeit the Puritans disquieted our Church about their conceived *Discipline*, yet they never moved any quarrel against the doctrine of our Church, which is well to be observed. *For if they had embraced any doctrine which the Church of England denied, they would assuredly have quarrelled about that as well, as they did about the Discipline.* BUT IT WAS THEN THE OPEN CONFESSION BOTH OF THE BISHOPS AND OF THE PURITANS, THAT BOTH PARTS EMBRACED A MUTUAL CONSENT IN DOCTRINE, ONLY THE DIFFERENCE WAS IN MATTER OF INCONFORMITY. THEN HITHERTO THERE WAS NO PURITAN DOCTRINE KNOWN. The first disturbers of this uniformity in doctrine were Barret and Baro, in Cambridge; and after them Thomson. Barret and Baro began this breach in the time of that most reverend prelate Archbishop Whitgift. Notwithstanding that these had attempted to disturb the doctrine of our Church, yet was the uniformity of doctrine still maintained. For when our Church was disquieted by Barret and Baro, the Bishops that then were in our Church examined the new doctrine of these men, and utterly disliked and rejected it; and in the point of Predestination confirmed that which they understood to be the doctrine of the Church of England against Barret and Baro, who oppugned that doctrine. This was fully declared by both the Archbishops, Whitgift of Canterbury, and Hutton of York, with the other Bishops and learned men of both Provinces, who repressed Barret and Baro, refuted their doctrine, and justified the contrary, as appeareth by that Book which both the Archbishops then compiled."*

Bishop Carleton's view of the doctrine of our Church on the subject of Baptism will be found in a subsequent page.

But I do not think it necessary to enter further upon the subject in this place, my especial object having been, to show the views of doctrine prevailing here, at and near the times of the first publication and subsequent re-settlement of our Formularies. To know these is of vital importance for the determination of any controversy as to orthodoxy in our Church. For to suppose that those who voluntarily established or re-established

* Examination of those things wherein the author of the late Appeal holdeth the doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the doctrines of the Church of England. 2d Ed. Lond. 1626. 4to. pp. 6—9.

our Formularies, should have published Forms of Doctrine or Worship incompatible with an honest adherence to their own views, is so palpable an absurdity that it stands before all self-condemned. And how far the account above given of the received doctrine of our Church in the reigns of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, illustrates, nay, to a certain extent, settles, the points at issue in the Baptismal Controversy, I leave to the serious consideration of the reader.

It would be easy to show how completely the above argument as to the "Calvinism" (as it is called) of our Reformers is borne out by the testimony of many impartial witnesses. Thus the learned and impartial Mosheim says, that in England, after the death of Henry VIII.,—

"The universities, schools, and churches became the oracles of Calvinism, which also acquired new votaries among the people from day to day. Hence it happened, that when it was proposed, in the reign of Edward VI., to give a fixed and stable form of the doctrine and discipline of the Church, Geneva was acknowledged as a sister Church; and the theological system there established by Calvin was adopted, and rendered the public rule of faith in England."*

Similar testimony is borne by the historian Hume.†

And not only have impartial witnesses taken this view of the matter, but also some of those whose prejudices would have led them in an entirely opposite direction.

Of this the following extracts from a Review, which appeared in 1842 in the British Critic, will, I think, be considered a very sufficient proof. The reader is probably aware that this periodical (which has some time since ceased) was at that time the leading Tractarian Review, and the statements of the Article to which I allude, are so peculiarly frank, and so confirmatory of the view I have been endeavouring to establish in this chapter, of the received theology of our Church in the time of Edward and Elizabeth, that it may be worth while to add a few of them here. The Article is entitled, "Development of the Church in the Seventeenth Century," and occurs in the October Number for 1842 (pp. 300 et seq.) The following are a few extracts:

---

* Eccl. Hist. Cent. xvi. § 3. P. 2. ch. 2. par. 16. (Maclaine's transl. 1826. iv. 365).

† Hist. of Engl. ch. 31 anno 1629. (vol. vi. p. 271. ed 1778) and App. to Reign of James I. (iii. pp. 166, 167).

"Cranmer . . . receded from one point of doctrine to another, and he and his associates at last submitted to the fate of all secondary and inferior minds who come into contact with superior ones; they were obliged to bow to the master mind of Calvin, backed by the whole movement party in this country, over which he virtually presided,* and with which, by the residence of Bucer and Peter Martyr, and others of his school, as well as by his own letters, he kept up a constant communication. . . . So far as we can judge by signs or appearances, it [*i. e.* compliance with the foreigners] would probably before long, if the death of Edward VI. had not intervened, have swamped the English Church in one general alliance with continental Calvinism. Cranmer, for the last two or three years of Edward's reign, corresponded with Calvin with that view. . . The fact [of "foreign influence upon our Reformers"] *is too notorious to be disputed,*" &c. &c. "But *doctrine,* as well as ritual and external religion, suffered from the influence which the Calvinistic school was allowed to gain; *the whole Church, from one end to the other, was flooded with the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism, absolute election, reprobation, and the rest of the five points. They gained possession of both Universities; they were the recognised doctrines of our divinity schools, it was thought heretical to doubt them. Oxford (how different, how incongenial with everybody's idea of the place now) was the very focus of Genevan influence, its doctors and professors were Calvinistic preachers, its colleges and halls were seminaries of Calvinism.* UP TO A CONSIDERABLE TIME AFTER THE REFORMATION, HEYLIN MENTIONS ONLY TWO NAMES OF MERE PRIVATE PERSONS IN THAT UNIVERSITY, WHO EXPRESSED ANY PUBLIC DISAGREEMENT WITH THAT SYSTEM. The exiles who came from Frankfort and Geneva at the death of Queen Mary, doubly imbued, from their intercourse with the Protestants there, with the Calvinistic tenets, were *triumphant everywhere:* the bishoprics, deaneries, stalls, canonries, and all the benefices in the Church, were *monopolized by* them. Queen Elizabeth would gladly have dispensed with their services;† but only just come to the Crown, she was more afraid of the Papists than the Puritans, who were yet in embryo, and not formed into a distinct party; and moreover, *there was no one else to give the places to;* ALL THE WORLD WERE CALVINISTS. Heylin, trying to make out the best case he could for the Church, could only say, that as there were seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed

---

* This is not quite correct, but it shows the view of the writer as to the prevalence of Calvin's doctrine, even at that time, in our Church.

† This is a mistake, as her appointments clearly show; and we have Whitgift's testimony (as I have shewn above) to her belief in the truth of the Lambeth Articles.

the knee to Baal when the apostasy was apparently universal; so there were doubtless *secret* believers in the true Church-doctrines even in those times, who, 'though few in number, served for a good assurance that the Church still kept possession of her primitive truths, not utterly lost, though much endangered by such contrary doctrines as had of late been thrust upon her.'"

Now these "Calvinists," be it remembered, are the parties to whom we are indebted for our present Formularies.

I proceed with the extracts:

"So much for the Calvinistic days of our Church; she was however even then [*i. e.* in the days of Field and Jackson, about the middle of the reign of James I.] upon the move, and the movement proceeded; even her Calvinism, as we have seen, had departed from *the continental Calvinism which the Reformation had introduced in the first instance;* it had divested itself of its deadly opposition to Church *forms.*"

"Nor were the changes we have been describing in the outward appearance of the Church mere movements upon the surface, but indications of a *sounder theology* that was *forming* underneath. A reaction against *the old Calvinistic doctrines* had *begun,* and was advancing with rapidity and success. Laud found Oxford a seminary of Calvinism, and he left it a school of orthodoxy: he found the foreign Reformers installed as its doctors and divines, and he left an English Reformer in their place, who has maintained himself in it up to this day."

"Such is the relation in which we find the 'old' standing to the 'new Episcopal party;' nor can there be any greater mistake than that of stringing all our divines together, without distinction or explanation..... There *are* distinctions amongst our divines; our Church divinity has been, as a matter of fact, a *progressive,* not a *stationary* one. *The Laudean school was as clearly a* NEW DEVELOPMENT *of the Church, in its day, as history can shew it.* And be it well noted, it was a *successful* development; it *established* itself. Laud and his party were '*innovators in their day;*' but how are they regarded now? As our great doctors, the highest standards, and brightest ornaments of the Church ... The truth is, these divines, by dint of immense effort, by a great and strong heave, lifted the Church above the levels of Calvinism to a higher ground, and that ground has remained our *terra firma* to this day. SEE HOW BISHOP TOMLINE, IN HIS ANSWER TO SCOTT, IS OBLIGED TO APOLOGIZE FOR THE DIVINES BEFORE THAT TIME; THAT BISHOP TOMLINE WAS ENABLED TO TAKE THE ANTI-CALVINISTIC SIDE, AS THE CHURCH SIDE OF THE QUESTION; THAT THE CHURCH WAS FOR HIM, AND

AGAINST HIS ANTAGONIST, HE MIGHT THANK LAUD, AND NOT THE REFORMERS. THE PRESENT ORTHODOX DIVINITY OF OUR CHURCH IS A DEVELOPMENT SINCE THE REFORMATION, AND A REACTION UPON IT. We care not how great innovators the school were considered in their time, or upon HOW SLENDER A THREAD they seemed to hang: they succeeded, and their *innovation* is now our *rule*. The Church cannot shake off the Laudean school: she has identified herself with them; she has accepted their ground, and she stands upon it." (pp. 328—345.)

It is only necessary to remind the reader, that our Formularies, which are our only authoritative standards of appeal, *remain* (speaking generally) as settled by the earlier "Calvinistic" School.

One more passage will conclude my extracts from this instructive and important Article.

"Upon *the plainest historical grounds*, then, supported by the testimony of popular opinion at the present day, we have the fact established of a change in our Church theology—a change since the Reformation—the development of a standard divinity in a later age *different from the standard divinity of a former. Calvin and his school were the master spirits of the Reformation; they gave the impulse, and thus left a stamp upon the movement which cannot be mistaken;* LET HISTORY FOR ONCE BE ALLOWED TO SPEAK. The full development of Calvinism was stopped indeed, but only because the Reformation itself was stopped, AND ITS PECULIAR DOCTRINES REMAINED THE THEOLOGY OF OUR CHURCH TILL LAUD UPSET THEM. Let us hear no more of the sure middle ground which the English Church has kept from the first—we are too glad to have had such a ground—BUT INSTEAD OF BEING THE GROUND OF THE REFORMATION, IT WAS A REACTION UPON IT.... Why uphold a mere *view*, a pretty solacing theory, when *the first breath of history must send our bandbox hypothesis to the winds?* Why not confess, what harm can there be in acknowledging *the truth*, that ours was in spirit *a Calvinistic Reformation*, and that a noble episcopate afterwards *reclaimed* us? If the one fact be humiliating, the other is a counterbalance to it; and our Church, between them both, would stand where she now stands." (pp. 384, 385.)

This witness is true; and most certainly comes from a quarter where overwhelming evidence in its favour would alone have led to such explicit confessions.

Is it possible, then, that after all this accumulated evidence as

to the doctrine of our Reformers and earliest divines, (it signifies not, *how* they were induced to embrace it,) any one can have the hardihood to maintain, that our Formularies are not (to say the least) thoroughly consistent with what are called "Calvinistic" views on the subject of Predestination and the Final Perseverance of those who have true faith and are regenerate?

In fact, the Article in the British Critic is a confession of an adversary, that, in matters of doctrine, the original "Church principles" of our Reformed Church were those which are now railed at under the names of Puritanism and Calvinism. And of course one of the most important points involved in those views, is the doctrine of the effects of Baptism.

Consequently, the assertion of our modern "High Churchmen," that the universal spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism is the genuine doctrine of our Church, is opposed to the clearest testimony of history. Such a notion is utterly incompatible with the system of doctrine maintained by our Reformers.

And my great object in drawing attention to the "Calvinistic" views (as they are improperly termed) of our early divines on certain points, has been to make manifest this fact. I am not contending that the Formularies of our Church *must* be understood by all in a "Calvinistic" sense on these points. My conviction is, that they were drawn up so as to admit of a considerable latitude of interpretation. I am not myself prepared to acquiesce in all the views which the extracts given in this chapter show were maintained by the great majority of our early divines. But one thing is clear, that to insist upon the necessity of such an interpretation of our Formularies as would place them in direct antagonism to the theological system of those who drew them up, is an act of direct and palpable injustice.

There is one more remark also, which I ought here to make, and that is, that a denial of the doctrine of the universal spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism is by no means peculiar to those whose views are of a "Calvinistic" complexion. It has been equally opposed by others holding very different views of doctrine. Our Formularies, therefore, may be interpreted in an Arminian sense, and yet the doctrine of the universal spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism, be repudiated as strongly as it is by the most zealous Calvinist.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE CONFESSIONS OF THE FOREIGN PROTESTANT CHURCHES AND DIVINES RESPECTING THE EFFECT OF BAPTISM.

The connexion which has been shown in the last Chapter to have existed between the doctrine of our Reformers and that of the "Reformed" Churches on the Continent, renders it a matter of some importance to know in what way the Confessions of those Churches speak of the effects of baptism; more especially as the Bishop of Exeter was disposed for some time to claim them as supporting his doctrine on the subject. The claim (though withdrawn in the *second* edition of his Lordship's Charge) is one which it is of importance to notice, because it shows the mode in which general statements as to the salutary effects of baptism,—made unhesitatingly by the Reformers, but (as I shall show hereafter) only as applying to them when blessed by God to the fulfilment of their appointed end, in carrying out *his* will,—have been misconstrued by his Lordship as indicating the maintenance of a doctrine to which the authors of those statements were diametrically opposed. And I cannot help observing, by the way, that we are thus furnished with a clue to the ground of that confidence with which his Lordship maintains that his view is that of our own Church; a notion which I humbly hope to show is as unfounded as his similar misconception of the doctrine of the foreign Protestants, and arising from a similar cause.

No statement, indeed, which his Lordship could have made, could have been better calculated to throw discredit upon his interpretation of the phraseology of our Church on the subject, than this appeal in its favour to the similar phraseology of the foreign Protestant Confessions. The fact is, that of the five

Protestant Confessions he has quoted,* (for the Catechism of Heidelberg is a species of Confession) three belong to that system of doctrine which is commonly called Calvinistic, in which none but "the elect," the certain heirs of salvation, are held to be *ever regenerated* by the Spirit of God. And the phraseology to which the Bishop so triumphantly appealed as showing that these Churches agreed with him and the Church of Rome (for the Bishop himself joins them), as to the effects of Baptism, refers only to such persons, and is therefore only applicable to a portion of the baptized. And if his Lordship was better acquainted than he evidently is with the works of the Reformers, he would know that it was a view entertained by many of them that regeneration was always given to "the elect" in baptism. And consequently they had no hesitation in using language with respect to Baptism, which, by one not aware of their real views, might be supposed to favour the Bishop's doctrine, but which in their minds applied only to the elect children of God. And that such was the interpretation generally given to our own Baptismal Service at the period of the Reformation, I shall endeavour hereafter to show.

Thus, for instance, the Bishop refers to "the Confession of Helvetia." A more intimate acquaintance with these Confessions would have probably induced his Lordship to state *which* Confession of Helvetia he means, as there are two, the former and the latter.† However, I believe there is practically little doubt to which the reference is made, as *the names of the Confessions quoted are just those contained in a work published at Oxford for young students*, called "Sylloge Confessionum,"‡ and in the order in which they there stand; and the Confession there given as the Confession of Helvetia is the latter, or that of 1566. The authority of this compilation for styling it *the* Confession of Helvetia will, I suppose, hardly be pressed by any one who is aware that the Editor of the first edition knew so little

---

* "The Helvetic, that of Augsburg, the Saxon, the Belgic, and the Catechism of Heidelberg." (Charge, 1st edit. p. 10.)

† Augusti, in his edition of the Libri Symbol. Eccles. Reform., reckons three, counting as the first that of Basle, in 1532. But Niemeyer gives the name of Helvetic Confession to two only, namely, that of 1536, sometimes called the second of Basle, and that of 1566.

‡ 1804. 8vo. 2nd ed. 1827. 8vo.

about the matter that he gave the *Confessio Variata* of 1540 as the genuine Augsburg Confession of 1530.*

Now this latter Confession of Helvetia was *written by Bullinger*, a fact which alone shows the Bishop's mistake in quoting it. But the internal testimony alone is quite sufficient to prove it

First, however, let us observe the language in which *the benefit of baptism* is spoken of, which will show us the way in which those who held Calvinistic views on the subject were in the habit of representing it.

The following is the description of the nature of the Sacraments generally.

"Sacraments are mystical symbols or holy rites, or sacred actions instituted by God himself, consisting of his word, of signs, *and the things signified*, by which he keeps in memory, and from time to time recalls to mind, his greatest blessings conferred upon man; by which also he seals his promises, and outwardly represents, and as it were places before our eyes, to be contemplated, those things which he himself gives to us internally, and thus confirms and increases our faith, the Spirit of God working in our hearts; by which finally he separates us from all other peoples and religions, and consecrates and binds us to himself alone, and signifies what he requires from us."†

"We do not approve of their doctrine, who speak of the Sacraments merely as common signs, not sanctified or *efficacious*."‡

"To be baptized in the name of Christ is to be inscribed, initiated, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance, of the sons of God, moreover to be now called by the name of God, that is, to be entitled a son of God, to be cleansed likewise from the pollution of our sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God, that we may lead a new and innocent life," &c. &c.§

---

* The Editor of the second edition of the Sylloge, has therefore added a copy of the first edition, printed in 1531.

† Sunt autem Sacramenta, symbola mystica, vel ritus sancti, aut sacræ actiones a Deo ipso institutæ, constantes verbo suo, signis, et rebus significatis, quibus in Ecclesia summa sua beneficia, homini exhibita, retinet in memoria, et subinde renovat, quibus item promissiones suas obsignat, et quæ ipse nobis interius præstat, exterius repræsentat, ac veluti oculis contemplanda subjicit, adeoque fidem nostram, Spiritu Dei in cordibus nostris operante, roborat et auget: quibus denique nos ab omnibus aliis populis et religionibus separat, sibique soli consecrat et obligat, et quid a nobis requirat, significat. (Sylloge Confess. ed. 2ª pp. 74, 75. I quote from the edition the Bishop of Exeter apparently uses.)

‡ Neque probamus eorum doctrinam, qui de Sacramentis perinde loquuntur, ut signis communibus, non sanctificatis aut efficacibus. (Ib. p. 79.)

§ Etenim baptizari in nomine Christi, est inscribi, initiari, et recipi in

Now, take these general statements, and you may no doubt reasonably draw from them the doctrine of the *universal efficacy* of the Sacrament of Baptism. No limitation is implied in the words, intimating that the Sacrament is efficacious only in certain cases.

But what is meant by these passages is clear, both from the known doctrine of the author, and from other parts of the Confession.

Thus it is said elsewhere,—

"Whence baptism is called by some a sign of initiation of the people of God, as being that by which *the elect of God* are consecrated unto God."*

And still more clearly is this expressed in the preceding chapter on "the Sacraments in general;" where it is said,—

"But the principal thing which in all the Sacraments is offered by God, and looked to by all the saints of all times (which others call the substance and matter of the Sacraments), is Christ the Saviour . . . . . by whom *all the elect* are circumcised without hands by the Holy Spirit, and are cleansed from all their sins, and are nourished with the true body and blood of Christ unto eternal life."†

And in the chapter on Faith (c. 16.) it is said,—

"But this faith is the mere gift of God, which God alone out of his free favour gives *to his elect*, according to measure, and when, to whom, and how much he wills, and that by his Holy Spirit, through the means of the preaching of the Gospel and faithful prayer."‡

---

fœdus, atque familiam, adeoque in hæreditatem filiorum Dei, imo jam nunc nuncupari nomine Dei, id est, appellari filium Dei, purgari item a sordibus peccatorum, et donari varia Dei gratia, ad vitam novam et innocentem. Ib. p. 80.

* Unde a nonnullis Baptismus nuncupatus est signum initiale populi Dei, utpote quo initiantur Deo electi Dei. c. 20. Ed. Oxon. 1827, p. 80.

† Cæterum præcipuum illud, quod in omnibus Sacramentis proponitur a Deo, et attenditur a piis omnibus omnium temporum (quod alii nuncupant substantiam et materiam Sacramentorum) Christus est Servator. . . . per quem electi omnes circumciduntur sine manibus per Spiritum Sanctum, abluunturque a peccatis suis omnibus, et aluntur vero corpore et sanguine Christi ad vitam æternam. Ib. p. 76.

‡ Hæc autem fides merum est Dei donum, quod solus Deus ex gratia sua, electis suis, secundum mensuram, et quando, cui, et quantum ipse vult, donat, et quidem per Spiritum Sanctum, mediante prædicatione evangelii et oratione fidei." Ib. p. 54.

"We know that a man is neither created, nor *regenerated by faith*, that he should be idle, &c."*

But it would be wasting time to proceed further† in a point about which no one well informed on the subject can have a moment's doubt.

It may be worth while, however, to add the words of the *earlier* Helvetic Confession on the subject.

"Baptism is by the institution of the Lord the laver of regeneration, which [regeneration] the Lord gives *to his elect* by a visible sign through the ministry of the Church, as it is above expressed. With which holy laver we on that account baptize our infants, because it is impious to reject from the communion of the people of God those who are sprung from us, (who are the people of God) and are all but pointed out for this by the voice of God, especially since *we ought piously to presume of their election.*"‡

I proceed to the Belgic Confession. Here again we find the same general expressions used, and used in the same sense.

"The Sacraments," says this Confession, "are signs and visible symbols of things internal and invisible, *by which, as by means, God himself works in us by the power of the Holy Spirit*," &c.§

Take these words by themselves, and they will support the doctrine of the universal efficacy of baptism. They are in fact precisely similar to the words in our 27th Article, which are insisted upon by our "High Church" divines as conclusive in favour of their view. But those who used them clearly confined that efficacy to "the elect." Regeneration is expressly ascribed

---

* Cum sciamus hominem nec conditum nec regenitum esse per fidem, ut otietur, sed potius, &c. Ib. p. 55.

† Among other passages we may observe the following,—"Neque vero approbamus istorum quoque doctrinam, qui docent gratiam et res significatas, signis ita alligari et includi, ut quicunque signis exterius participent, etiam interius gratiæ rebusque significatis participes sint, quales quales sint." (p. 79.)

‡ Baptisma quidem ex institutione Domini lavacrum regenerationis quam Dominus electis suis visibili signo per ecclesiæ ministerium (qualiter supra expositum est) exhibeat. Quo quidem sancto lavacro infantes nostros idcirco tingimus, quoniam e nobis (qui populus Domini sumus) genitos populi Dei consortio rejicere nefas est, tantum non divina voce huc designatos, præsertim quum de eorum electione pie est præsumendum. (Coll. Confess. in Eccles. Reform. ed Niemeyer. Lips. 1840, 8vo. p. 120.)

§ Sunt enim sacramenta, signa ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quæ, ceu per media, Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis agit. c. 33. Syll. Conf. p. 348.

to faith.* And (to quote no more) the following passage is decisive on the point.

"Those that are *regenerate* have in them a double life; one carnal and temporal, which they brought with them from their first nativity, and this is common to all; the other spiritual and heavenly, which is given them in that second birth which takes place through the word of the Gospel in the union of the body of Christ, and *this is peculiar to the elect of God alone.*"†

Such is the language of a Confession which the Bishop of Exeter, misinterpreting words used in one part of it, quoted as agreeing with his view.

I now proceed to the Heidelberg Catechism. Among the questions and answers on Baptism are these.—

"*Q.* 69. In what way are you admonished and confirmed in baptism, that you are a partaker of that one sacrifice of Christ?

"Because Christ has commanded the external laver of water, with this promise annexed, that I am not less certainly washed by his blood and Spirit from the pollutions of the soul, that is, from all my sins, than I am cleansed externally by water, by which the pollutions of the body are used to be washed away.

"*Q.* 70. What is it to be cleansed by the blood and Spirit of Christ?

"It is to receive from God remission of sins freely on account of the blood of Christ, which he in his sacrifice upon the cross poured forth for us; and then also to be renewed by the Holy Spirit, and through sanctification by him to become a member of Christ, by which we more and more die to our sins, and live holily and unblameably.

"*Q.* 71. Where has Christ promised that he will as certainly cleanse us by his blood and Spirit, as we are cleansed by the water of baptism?

"In the institution of Baptism, in these words, 'Go and teach all nations,' &c. (Matt. xxviii. 19.); 'He that believeth and is baptized,' &c. (Mark xvi. 16.) This promise is repeated when Scrip-

* Credimus veram hanc fidem per auditum verbi Dei et Spiritus Sancti operationem unicuique nostrum inditam nos regenerare, atque veluti novos homines efficere. c. 24. ib. p. 341.

† Qui vero regenerati sunt duplicem in se vitam habent: unam quidem carnalem et temporariam, quam secum a prima sua nativitate attulerunt, et hæc communis est omnibus; alteram spiritualem et cœlestem, quæ illis donatur in secunda illa nativitate quæ fit per verbum Evangelii in unione corporis Christi, et hæc solis electis Dei peculiaris est. c. 35. Ib. p. 350.

ture calls baptism the laver of regeneration (Tit. iii. 5) and the washing away of sins." (Acts. xxii. 16.)*

Now to a superficial reader, unacquainted with the context or the views of those who drew up the form, these words might doubtless seem to favour the Bishop's doctrine. But that they should be quoted in support of it by one pretending to any learning on the subject, is indeed extraordinary. And the reference is another instructive proof of the fallaciousness of the argument which the Bishop derives from the use of such language, as showing that the authors of it must have held his view. It is, indeed, as decisive a proof of the unsoundness of the Bishop's position as he could have supplied us with; for the language is as explicit and precise as any which he can adduce from our own Formularies, and yet was far enough from being intended (as I shall immediately show) to speak his Lordship's doctrine. The fact is, that the Catechism of Heidelberg is a strictly Calvinistic Confession, written by Zachary Ursinus, a staunch Calvinist, assisted by Peter Olivianus.

The 54th Question and Answer, (not to mention others) might have sufficiently shown this even to one ignorant of its history.

"What believest thou concerning the Holy and Catholic Church of Christ?—I believe that the Son of God doth, from the beginning of the world to the end, gather, defend, and preserve unto himself, by his Spirit and word, out of whole mankind, *a company chosen to everlasting life*, and agreeing in true faith: and that *I am a lively member of that company, and so shall remain for ever*."†

I refer the reader to the note below for other passages.‡

---

* Syll Confess. pp. 376, 377. The Catechism is so common, that it seems hardly necessary to give here the original Latin.

† This translation is from "The Sum of Christian Religion, &c. By Z Ursinus. Englished by D. H. Parry, 1645." fol. pp. 346, 347. The original Latin is as follows:—

"Quid credis de sancta et catholica Christi Ecclesia?

"Credo Filium Dei, ab initio mundi ad finem usque, sibi ex universo genere humano cœtum ad vitam æternam electum, per Spiritum suum et verbum, in vera fide consentientem, colligere, tueri, ac servare, meque vivum ejus cœtus membrum esse, et perpetuo mansurum." Syll. Conf. p. 373.

‡ "Quoniam igitur sola fides nos Christi atque omnium ejus beneficiorum participes facit: unde proficiscitur hæc fides?

"A Spiritu Sancto, qui eam per prædicationem Evangelii in cordibus nostris accendit, et per usum sacramentorum confirmat.

And it so happens that the author of the Catechism has himself left us an Explication of it; in which, commenting upon the question and answer just quoted, he observes, (after stating that the good pleasure of God is the sole reason why one is elected and another a reprobate,) that "the effect of election is the whole work of our salvation, and all the degrees of our redemption . . . faith, justification, *regeneration*, good works, final perseverance," &c.;* and that the reprobate [i. e. all those who finally perish] are not "*ever* members of the invisible Church, that is, of the Church and company of saints."† And in a previous passage he maintains that the regenerate never lose wholly the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and never finally fall away.‡ And, in a word, in his Theological Theses, publicly maintained at Heidelberg, he expressly says, "Neither yet are all those who are baptized with water, (whether they be of understanding [adults] or infants) partakers of the grace of Christ: for the everlasting election of God, and his calling into the kingdom of Christ, is free."§

Consequently the meaning of the Catechism, so far as it seems to connect regeneration with baptism, is this, that regeneration takes place in baptism in the case of the elect; but it does not admit that this effect is produced in any others at that time, for it denies that in such it is *ever* produced. And this was a common view of that period.

But, as the Bishop intimates, that not only the Confessions he mentions support his view, but that there was a general consent in its favour among the Protestant Churches, I will offer his

---

"Quid sunt Sacramenta?

"Sunt sacra et in oculos incurrentia signa ac sigilla, ob eam causam a Deo instituta, ut per ea nobis promissionem Evangelii magis *declaret et obsignet*; quod scilicet non universis tantum, verum etiam singulis *credentibus*, propter unicum illud Christi sacrificium in cruce peractum, gratis donet remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam." (p. 376.)

"Estne ergo externus baptismus aquæ ipsa peccatorum ablutio?

"Non est: nam solus sanguis Jesu Christi purgat nos ab omni peccato." (p. 377.)

* The Sum of Christian Religion, &c. p. 357.

† Ib. p. 359.

‡ Ib. p. 56.

§ Ib. p. 426. The original Latin is, "Neque autem omnes qui baptizantur aqua, sive infantes, sive adulti, gratiæ Christi fiunt participes. Libera enim est æterna Dei electio et ad Christum vocatio. Corp. Doctr. Christian. Ursini. Genev. 1623, 8vo. Appendix, p. 126.

Lordship some further testimonies from the Confessions of the Reformed Churches on the subject.

For instance, let us refer to the Gallican Confession. No doubt it tells us, that in both the Sacraments "God really, that is, truly and *efficaciously*, gives us *whatever he there sacramentally shadows forth*, and therefore we annex to the signs the true *possession and fruition* of that thing which is thus offered us."* Could stronger words be used to express the efficacy of baptism? But who are the parties spoken of? Clearly, from other parts of the Confession, those whom God pleases to make his children, by giving them of his own free mercy saving faith.† And regeneration is expressly attributed to faith.‡

So in the Bohemian Confession of 1575, while in the Articles on the Sacraments and Baptism, (Art. 13, 14), strong language is used as to the benefits of baptism, yet in other parts regeneration is expressly attributed to faith.§

I will quote but one more, as it seems quite unnecessary to heap up evidence on the point. But the language of the "Consensus Tigurinus" (or Agreement of the divines of Zurich with Calvin and Farell, drawn up in 1549), is very specific on the subject.

"Moreover," they say, "we diligently teach, that God does not

---

* Credimus, sicut antea dictum est, tam in cœna quam in Baptismo Deum nobis reipsa, id est, vere et efficaciter donare quicquid ibi sacramentaliter figurat, ac proinde cum signis conjungimus veram possessionem ac fruitionem ejus rei quæ ita nobis offertur. Art. 37. Confess. ed. Niemeyer, p. 338.

† Credimus nos arcana Sancti Spiritus gratia donari fidei lumine, quæ sit *gratuitum Dei donum, et iis unis proprium, quibus Deo libuit illud tribuere*, ut non habeant fideles, de quo in seipsis glorientur, cum potius duplo sint obligatiores quod cæteris præferantur. Sed et illud credimus, *fidem electis dari*, non ut semel tantum in rectam viam introducantur, quin potius, ut in ea ad extremum usque pergant, quia sicut a Deo initium est, ita etiam est complementum. Art. 21. Ib. p. 334. See also Art. 12, p. 332.

‡ Credimus nos qui natura servi sumus peccati, hac eadem fide intercedente in novam vitam regenerari. Art. 22. Ib. p. 334.

§ Atque ita sanctificatio, renovatio vel regeneratio hominis fit per fidem et Spiritum Sanctum, quando per fidem in Christum Dominum participes reddimur Jesu Christi [et] omnium meritorum ejus, atque hoc pacto perfecte coram Deo justificamur. Art. 8. Ib. p. 830. Salvifica fides.... homini credenti affert remissionem peccatorum, reconciliationem cum Deo, justificationem, regenerationem per Spiritum Sanctum, et vitam æternam. Art. 9. Ib. p. 832.

put forth his power without distinction in all who receive the Sacraments, but only in the elect. For as he enlightens, so as to produce faith in, those only whom he has pre-ordained to life, so by the secret power of his Spirit he causes that the elect are made partakers of those things which the Sacraments offer." "By this doctrine that *figment of the Sophists* is overthrown, which teaches, that the Sacraments of the New Law *confer grace on all who do not put in the way the obstacle of mortal sin.* For besides that in the Sacraments nothing is received but by faith; it is also to be held, that the grace is by no means to be tied to them, so that whosoever has the sign, enjoys also the reality. For the signs are ministered to the reprobate equally as to the elect, but the reality of the signs comes to the latter only."*

But still they say, "Although we distinguish, as is just, between the signs and the things signified, yet we do not disconnect the reality from the signs;" words which, according to the Bishop of Exeter's mode of interpreting such statements, would be conclusive in his favour. But they immediately explain themselves as meaning by this, that all those *who by faith embrace the promises there offered* receive Christ spiritually with his spiritual gifts.†

An *exposition* of the Articles of Agreement follows, written by Calvin himself, who upon this head remarks,—

"What further will good men require here? Do they maintain that God acts through the Sacraments? This we teach. Do they maintain that our faith is exercised, nourished, assisted, confirmed in them? We maintain the same. Do they maintain that the power of the Holy Spirit exists in them, so that they are of avail to God's elect for salvation? The same we also grant. The

* Præterea sedulo docemus, Deum non promiscue vim suam exercere in omnibus qui sacramenta recipiunt, sed tantum in electis. Nam quemadmodum non alios in fidem illuminat, quam quos præordinavit ad vitam, ita arcana Spiritus sui virtute efficit, ut percipiant electi quæ offerunt sacramenta. Art. 16.—Hac doctrina evertitur illud Sophistarum commentum, quod docet sacramenta Novæ Legis conferre gratiam omnibus non ponentibus obicem peccati mortalis. Præterquam enim quod in sacramentis nihil nisi fide percipitur, tenendum quoque est, minime alligatam ipsis esse Dei gratiam, ut quisquis signum habeat, re etiam potiatur. Nam reprobis peræque ut electis signa administrantur, veritas autem signorum ad hos solos pervenit. Art. 17. Confess. ed. Niemeyer, p. 195.

† Quare etsi distinguimus, ut par est, inter signa et res signatas: tamen non disjungimus a signis veritatem; quin omnes *qui fide amplectuntur* illic oblatas promissiones, Christum spiritualiter cum spiritualibus ejus donis recipere. Art. 9. Ib. p. 193, 194.

question hinges upon this, whether it is proper to ascribe to God alone altogether all the parts of our salvation, or whether he himself permits the Sacraments to share part of that honour while he uses them." "What we say, that the [Sacramental] signs do not profit all without distinction, but the elect of God only, to whom the inward and efficacious operation of the Spirit comes, is *too evident to need a long argument.* For if any one wishes to make its effect common to all, besides that such a figment is refuted by the testimony of Scripture, experience also opposes it."*

But nevertheless no one has used stronger language than Calvin himself as to the value and efficacy of baptism.

The following passages are but a few of those that might be quoted in proof of this.

"Inasmuch as the instruments used by the Holy Spirit are not dead, God truly effects and bestows through Baptism what it represents."†

"Yet nevertheless it is vain cavil, that I mock men with ambiguous words, as if the acceptance which takes place by Baptism were nothing else than an external declaration in the sight of men: since I openly affirm, that in Baptism we deal with God, who not only by a testimony of his paternal love pledges his faith to us, so that we may be certainly assured of our salvation, but also himself establishes within us by his own power what he represents by the hand of the minister."‡

---

* Quid etiam hic requirent boni viri? Deum per sacramenta agere volunt? Hoc docemus. Volunt in ipsis fidem nostram exerceri, foveri, adjuvari, confirmari? Idem asserimus. Volunt Spiritus Sancti virtutem in illis extare, ut electis Dei in salutem prosint? Idem nos quoque concedimus. In eo vertitur quæstionis status: soline Deo in solidum adscribere conveniat omnes salutis nostræ partes, an ejus laudis partem ipse ad sacramenta derivet, dum illis utitur. . . . . Quod dicimus, non omnibus promiscue, sed electis Dei tantum, ad quos interior et efficax Spiritus operatio pervenit, prodesse signa, clarius est quam ut longa refutatione indigeat. Nam si quis omnibus communem facere velit effectum, præterquam quod Scripturæ testimonio refellitur tale commentum, experientia etiam reclamat. Ib. pp. 208, 209.

† Quia mortua non sunt Spiritus Sancti organa, vere per Baptismum efficit ac præstat Deus, quod figurat. (See Def. de Sacram. contra Westphal. Op. 1671, vol. viii. p. 683.)

‡ Frivolum tamen interea est cavillum, me ludere ambiguo sermone, ac si receptio quæ fit per baptismum, nihil aliud foret, quam externa coram hominibus declaratio: siquidem palam affirmo, nobis in baptismo cum Deo esse negotium, qui non modo paternum amorem testando, fidem nobis suam obligat, ut de salute nostra certo simus persuasi, sed etiam quod per ministri manum figurat, ipse intus sua virtute sancit. (Ib.)

"For we also admit the necessary use of Baptism; that it is not lawful for any one to omit it through neglect or contempt. And thus we by no means make it a rite which we are free to observe or not. Nor do we only strictly bind the faithful to its observance; but we also maintain it to be God's ordinary instrument to wash and renew us, and moreover to communicate salvation to us.*

"I will willingly allow, that the use of those things which Christ has given us as helps to salvation, may be said to be necessary; to wit, when the power of using them is given us."†

"If there are any who deny, that there is contained in the Sacraments the grace which they represent, we blame them."‡

"We agree, that Sacraments are not empty figures, but do truly supply whatever they represent: that the efficacy of the Spirit is present in Baptism to cleanse and regenerate us."§

"The reason why Paul teaches [Eph. v. 26.] that we are cleansed in Baptism, is, because God there testifies to us our cleansing, *and at the same time effectually works what He represents.* For unless the truth of the thing represented, or the exhibition of it, which is the same, were conjoined [with Baptism], that saying, Baptism is the laver of the soul, would be incorrect." ‖

"That principle ought to prevail with the pious, that God does not mock us with empty figures, but supplies inwardly by his own power what he manifests by the external sign. Wherefore Baptism is appropriately and truly called the laver of regeneration. He will take a right view of the power and use of the Sacraments, who so connects together the thing and the sign as not to make the sign empty or inefficacious, and at the same time not for the sake of

---

* Nam et nos baptismi usum necessarium confitemur: ne cui liceat vel negligentia, vel contemptu, ipsum omittere. Atque hoc modo nequaquam liberum facimus. Nec fideles modo severè adstringimus ad ejus observationem: sed ordinarium quoque Dei instrumentum asserimus, ad nos lavandos et renovandos, ad salutem denique nobis communicandam. (Antid. ad Conc. Trid. Sess. 7. Op. vol. viii. p. 258.)

† Facile patiar, ut quæ nobis Christus dedit salutis adjumenta, eorum usus necessarius dicatur: quando scilicet datur facultas. (Ib. p. 256.)

‡ Si qui sint qui negent, sacramentis contineri gratiam quam figurant, illos improbamus. (Ib.)

§ Convenit, non inanes esse figuras [*i. e.* sacramenta], sed re ipsa præstari [? præstare] quicquid figurant. In baptismo adesse Spiritus efficaciam, ut nos abluat et regeneret. (Calv. Ep. ad Melancth. 1554, Op. vol. ix. Epist., p. 82.)

‖ Quod baptismo nos ablui docet Paulus [in Eph. v. 26], ideo est, quod illic nobis ablutionem nostram testatur Deus, *et simul efficit quod figurat.* Nisi enim conjuncta esset rei veritas, aut exhibitio, quod idem est, impropria hæc loquutio esset. Baptismus est lavacrum animæ. (Calv. Comm. in Eph. v. 26. Op vol. vii., p. 350.)

magnifying the sign to take away from the Holy Spirit what belongs to Him."*

And so among the notes of the celebrated Genevan Version of the Bible, we find the following on the words "one body," in 1 Cor. xii. 13:—

"That we might be one body with Christ, and the whole Church one Christ: of the which conjunction Baptism and the Lord's Supper are effectual signs: for *by Baptism we are regenerate into one Spirit*, and by the Lord's Supper we are incorporate into Christ's Body, to be governed by the same Spirit."

The reply of Beza to one who accused him of holding that baptism is only a sign of regeneration, will perhaps be useful in illustrating the view taken of the efficacy of that Sacrament by some who still denied that it is always effective.

"Andreas is guilty of a double calumny when he says that Baptism is held by us to be only a sign or testimony of regeneration. For neither do we say that Baptism is only a sign, but a sacramental sign, that is, one with which, as far as concerns God, the thing signified is always truly given to be received by faith; nor do we say that the effect of Baptism is regeneration only, but also and more especially cleansing from sins. Moreover, he is no better logician than theologian, when from our saying that those baptized with the outward baptism are sometimes not partakers of the inward, he draws the conclusion that we make the symbols empty things; as if, forsooth, the consequence were valid, The interior is offered to all with the exterior, therefore the interior is received by all who receive the exterior: and of this most false and absurd inference these disputants, or rather slanderers, have been so frequently admonished, that it is difficult sufficiently to wonder at their denseness or obstinacy."†

---

* Principium illud valere debet inter pios, Deum non inanibus nobiscum figuris ludere, sed virtute sua intus præstare quod externo signo demonstrat. Quare baptismus congruenter et vere lavacrum regenerationis dicitur. Vim et usum sacramentorum recte is tenebit qui rem et signum ita connectet, ut signum non faciat inane aut inefficax: neque tamen ejus ornandi causa Spiritui Sancto detrahat quod suum est. (Id. in Tit. iii. 5. ib. p. 506.)

† Dupliciter calumniatur Andreas quum baptismum a nobis dicit tantum pro signo seu testimonio regenerationis haberi. Ego enim neque baptismum esse duntaxat signum dicimus, sed signum sacramentale, id est, cum quo, quod ad Deum attinet, res significata vere semper *fide accipienda* præbetur: neque regenerationem tantum, sed etiam vel in primis ablutionem a peccatis dicimus esse baptismi effectum. Deinde nihilo doctior est Logicus quam

And the peculiar case of infants is noticed in the following words;—

"But although it is probable that infants have not faith in the act (as they say), but only its seed, yet since they are comprehended in God's covenant, which cannot be of no effect, we justly think that they are reckoned among the people of God, and are bedewed with the Holy Spirit, who will in his own time put forth his power in them. For we do not limit the efficacy of Baptism to that moment of time in which it is given, but we know that it yields good fruit according to the good pleasure of God."*

Such, then, was the doctrine of the "Reformed" Churches of the Continent on this subject;—of those Churches whose doctrine (as distinguished from the views both of the Romish and Lutheran Churches,) is said by some of the most able and distinguished of our earliest Protestant divines (as we have seen in a preceding chapter) to be *in all points agreeable to that of our own Church.*

There remain the Confessions of Augsburg and Saxony, both drawn up by Melancthon, which I shall now proceed to consider.

Now as it respects the *latter*, whatever may be the precise doctrine it is intended to teach on this subject, the following passage (to which others might be added) is sufficient to show that it was not the doctrine of our modern "High Church" divines.

"But we have shown above, that by faith is signified a reliance upon the Son of God, the Propitiator, on account of whom we are received, and please God, not on account of our virtues or fulfilling of

---

Theologus, quum ex eo quod baptismo exteriore baptizatos dicimus interdum interioris non esse participes, a nobis exinaniri symbola colligit: quasi videlicet valeat hæc consequutio, præbetur omnibus interior cum exteriore, ergo ab omnibus qui exteriorem recipiunt, interior recipitur: de qua mere falsissima et absurdissima collectione quum toties sint isti disputatores an conviciatores admoniti, quis illorum vel stuporem vel pervicaciam satis possit admirari? (Bezæ Tract. Theol. vol. 3, p. 126, ed. Gen. 1582, fol.)

* Etsi autem infantes verisimile est fidem ipso actu (quod aiunt) non habere, sed duntaxat ejus semen, tamen quum in fœdere Dei comprehendantur, quod irritum esse non potest, merito arbitramur, eos in peculio Domini censeri, et Spiritu Sancto perfundi, qui suo tempore virtutem in illis exerat. Neque enim baptismi efficaciam ad illud temporis momentum restringimus quo exhibetur, sed illum pro bona Dei voluntate scimus fructum bonum edere. (Bezæ Tract. Theol. vol. 1, p. 333. ed. Gen. 1573. fol.)

the Law. But since in this very consolation, the confidence with which we repose on the Son of God is truly a feeling kindled by the Holy Spirit, by which the heart is quickened into life and freed from eternal death, *this conversion is called regeneration ;* John iii., Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, &c. And now the man becomes truly the dwelling-place of God, who is effectual in him," &c.*

It is needless to quote more, but I would recommend the whole chapter to the reader's perusal, as showing the decided discrepancy of the theology of this Confession with that of modern "High Churchism."

Lastly, as to the Confession of Augsburg. Its words are these ;—

"Concerning Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, and that through Baptism is offered the grace of God ; and that children are to be baptized, who being offered to God by baptism are received into the favor of God. They condemn the Anabaptists, who disapprove the baptism of children, and affirm that children may be saved without baptism." Art. 9.†

But with this we must connect the 13th Article, which runs thus ;—

"Concerning the use of the Sacraments they teach, that the Sacraments are instituted, not only that they may be marks of pro-

---

* Ostendimus autem supra, fide significari fiduciam acquiescentem in Filio Dei propitiatore, propter quem recipimur et placemus, non propter nostras virtutes aut legis impletionem. Cum autem in hac ipsa consolatione, fiducia, qua acquiescimus in Filio Dei, vere sit motus accensus a Spiritu Sancto, quo vivificatur cor, et liberatur ex æterna morte, dicitur hæc conversio, regeneratio ; Joan. iii., Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu. Et fit homo jam vere domicilium Dei, qui est in eo efficax. Syll. Confess. ed. Oxon. 1827, p. 258.

† De baptismo docent, quod sit necessarius ad salutem, quodque per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei ; et quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblati Deo recipiantur in gratiam Dei. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum, et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri. (Ib. p. 126.)

In the "Confessio Variata," or revised edition of the Confession, in 1540, this passage stands thus,—

De baptismo docent, quod necessarius sit ad salutem, tanquam *ceremonia* a Christo instituta. Et quod per baptismum offeratur gratia Dei : et quod infantes sint baptizandi : et quod infantes per baptismum Deo commendati, recipiantur in gratiam Dei, et fiant filii Dei, sicut Christus testatur, loquens de parvulis *in ecclesia ;* Matt. xviii , Non est voluntas Patris vestri qui in cœlis est, ut pereat unus ex parvulis istis. Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum infantum, et affirmant infantes sine baptismo et extra ecclesiam Christi salvos fieri. (Sylloge Conf. ed. 2ª, pp. 171, 172.)

fession among men, but rather that they may be signs and evidences of the goodwill of God towards us, set forth to excite and confirm faith in those who use them. Therefore the Sacraments are to be used so as that faith is present, which believes the promises that are exhibited and shown by the Sacraments. Therefore they condemn those who teach that the Sacraments justify *ex opere operato* [evidently referring to the Romanists] and do not teach that there is required in the use of the Sacraments faith which believes that sins are remitted."*

And in the revised edition of this Confession in 1540, after the words "shown by the Sacraments," the following are added, —"By *this faith* we receive the promised grace which the Sacraments represent, and the Holy Spirit."

Now, in what way did Luther himself understand Art. 9? We have his sentiments fully expressed in a work published only the year before his Confession (i. e. in 1529), namely, his Larger Catechism. The following extracts will show his views,—

"The great efficacy and usefulness of Baptism being thus understood, let us further observe, *what sort of person it is* that receives such things as are offered by baptism. This again is most beautifully and clearly expressed in these words: He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. That is, faith alone makes a person worthy to receive with any profit this salutary and divine water. . . . *Without faith Baptism profits nothing*, although in itself it cannot be denied to be a heavenly and inestimable treasure."†

---

* De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint [sacramenta instituta esse, *corr.* 1540], non modo ut sint notæ professionis inter homines, sed [multo, *add.* 1540] magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, [proposita, *add.* 1540], ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proposita. [*del.* proposita, *et add.* eis. 1540]. Itaque utendum est sacramentis, ita ut fides accedat, [*transp. verba*, 1540], quæ credat promissionibus, quæ per sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur. [Hac fide accipimus promissam gratiam, quam sacramenta significant, et Spiritum Sanctum, *add.* 1540.] Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operato justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quæ credat remitti peccata. [Damnant igitur Pharisaicam opinionem, quæ obruit doctrinam de fide, nec docet fidem in usu sacramentorum requiri, quæ credat propter Christum nobis gratiam dari. Sed fingit homines justos esse propter usum sacramentorum ex opere operato, et quidem sine bono motu utentium, *corr.* 1540.] (Ib. pp. 127 et 173, 174.)

† Cognita jam ingenti cum virtute tum utilitate baptismi, videamus ulterius, quæ persona sit talia accipiens, quæ per baptismum offeruntur. Hoc iterum pulcherrime et clarissime in his verbis expressum est: Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit. Hoc est: sola fides personam

"*We bring a child to a minister of the Church to be baptized,* IN THIS HOPE AND PERSUASION, *that it certainly believes,* and we pray that God may give it faith."* "The word being joined to the water, baptism is to be *esteemed valid,* even though faith is not present. For my faith does not produce baptism, but recognizes and apprehends baptism. . . . *Even if children did not believe, which is by no means to be affirmed* (as has been already shown), yet their baptism would be true baptism, nor ought any one to rebaptize them."†

Hence he held, that baptism, though *valid* without faith in the receiver, was *profitable* only when there was faith; and *this in the case of children as well as adults.* The notion may seem to many in the present day singular, that infants should be considered as capable of faith, but it was shared with Luther by others at that time.

Such was Luther's view at the very time that he adopted as a declaration of his creed the Confession of Augsburg. He considered that children were brought to be baptized, under the supposition that they had faith; and he distinctly maintained that without faith baptism profits nothing.

This was not indeed subsequently the generally received doctrine of the Lutheran Churches as it regards infants, though I doubt whether Luther himself ever varied his doctrine upon the subject. But certainly the language of his Catechism cannot be mistaken, nor therefore the interpretation *he* would have given to the Confession of Augsburg. And it is of importance to observe this difference of view between Luther and most of his followers on this point, because we shall have occasion hereafter to apply a Baptismal Service drawn up by Luther in illustration of the meaning of our own.

The Apology of the Confession, published in the same year as

---

dignam facit, ut hanc salutarem et divinam aquam utiliter suscipiat . . . . *Citra fidem nihil prodest baptismus,* tametsi per sese cœlestis et inæstimabilis thesaurus esse negari non possit. Luther. Catech. Major, Art. De baptismo. Apud Libr. Symbol. Ed. Hase, 1846, p. 541.

* Puerum ecclesiæ ministro baptizandum apportamus, *hac spe atque animo, quod certò credat,* et precamur, ut Deus eum fide donet. Ib. p. 546.

† Accedente aquæ verbo, baptismus *rectus* habendus est, etiam non accedente fide. Neque enim fides mea facit baptismum, sed baptismum percipit et apprehendit. . . . . Quanquam pueri non crederent, quod nullo modo affirmandum est, (ut jam ostensum est) tamen baptismus verus esset, neque quisquam eos rebaptizare debet. (Ib. p. 545.)

the Confession, by Melancthon, and reckoned also one of the Symbolic Books of the Lutheran Church, condemns in strong terms the Romish doctrine on the subject.

"Here we condemn the whole set of the Scholastic doctors, who teach that the sacraments confer grace upon one who places no obstacle in the way from the very performance of the work without any good motion in him who uses them. This is simply a Jewish notion, to suppose, that we may be justified by a ceremony without any good motion of the heart, that is, without faith. And yet this impious and pernicious notion is taught with great authority in the whole realm of Popery. Paul (Rom. iv. 9, and seq.) protests against it, and denies that Abraham was justified by circumcision, but that circumcision was a sign set forth for the exercise of his faith. So we teach, that in the sacraments there ought to be present faith to believe those promises, and to receive the things promised, which are there offered in the Sacrament. And the reason is plain and most sure. The promise is useless, unless it is received by faith. But the sacraments are signs of the promises. . . . But no one can tell what abuses that fanatical notion of the *opus operatum* without any good motion in the user has produced in the Church."*

I have already remarked, that the Bishop of Exeter has, in the second edition of his Charge, withdrawn the statement that these foreign Protestant Churches, our own Church, and that of Rome, all agreed as to the doctrine of regeneration universally taking place in Baptism. But the note in which this withdrawal is made is so remarkable, that it may be well to insert it in this place.

"I have here withdrawn," his Lordship says, "a statement made by me, when I delivered this Charge, respecting the early Confessions

---

* Hic damnamus totum populum Scholasticorum doctorum, qui docent, quod sacramenta *non ponenti obicem* conferant gratiam *ex opere operato* sine bono motu utentis. Hæc simpliciter Judaica opinio est, sentire, quod *per ceremoniam* justificemur sine bono motu cordis, hoc est, sine fide. Et tamen hæc impia et perniciosa opinio magna auctoritate docetur in toto regno Pontificio. Paulus (Rom. iv. 9, seq.) reclamat et negat, *Abraham justificatum esse circumcisione, sed circumcisionem esse signum* propositum ad exercendam fidem. Ita nos docemus, quod in usu sacramentorum fides debeat accedere, quæ credat illis promissionibus, et accipiat res promissas, quæ ibi in sacramento offeruntur. Et est ratio plana et firmissima. *Promissio est inutilis, nisi fide accipiatur. At sacramenta sunt signa promissionum.* . . . Quantum autem in Ecclesia abusuum pepererit illa *fanatica opinio de opere operato* sine bono motu utentis, nemo verbis consequi potest. (Art. 7. De num. et usu Sacram. Libri Symbol. ed. Hase. p. 203.)

of Faith of foreign Protestants. Closer inspection (especially of the Confessions of those bodies which adopted the doctrines of Zwingle and Calvin), has discovered under *a seeming agreement with the doctrine of our Articles and Liturgy on Baptism,* a real and considerable difference. In more than one of these documents there are statements seemingly *inconsistent with each other,* which it is not for me to attempt to reconcile." (p. 10.)

That is to say, his Lordship cannot understand how any one can make a general statement as to the value and efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism, and at the same time hold that it is not efficacious in every case in which it is administered. I would humbly suggest, that the "seeming inconsistency" vanishes the moment we apply to the interpretation of these statements the system of doctrine held by their authors. And I cannot but further remark, that as there is (by his Lordship's confession) "a seeming agreement with the doctrine of our Articles and Liturgy on Baptism," in one portion of these statements, and that the "seemingly inconsistent" statements only need the light of the system of doctrine held by their authors to show them to be in perfect harmony with each other, so there will appear in *both* an evident "agreement with the doctrine of our Articles and Liturgy," if we will only view those Articles and Liturgy by the light of the same system of doctrine;—a system which our third Protestant Primate, Archbishop Grindal, (to mention no other authority) tells us is the system of our Church.

CHAPTER V.

THE DOCTRINE OF MARTIN BUCER AND PETER MARTYR, (WHO WERE PLACED BY ARCHBISHOP CRANMER, AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI., AS THE FIRST REGIUS PROFESSORS OF DIVINITY AT CAMBRIDGE AND OXFORD,) ON THE SUBJECT OF THE EFFECTS OF INFANT BAPTISM.

§ 1. *The Doctrine of Martin Bucer.*

THE position in which Martin Bucer was placed in this country by Archbishop Cranmer at the commencement of the Reformation in the reign of Edward VI., and other circumstances, to which I shall have hereafter to refer, connected with the name of that able Reformer, render it of much importance for us to know, what were his views on the subject of the present treatise.

I shall now proceed, then, to shew what was the doctrine of Bucer on this subject, as delivered in his works published *before* his arrival in this country. And I begin with an extract from the Conference held by him and other divines of the "Reformed" school with Luther and some of his followers at Wittenberg in 1536, because the result of that Conference was to induce him to modify some of his previous statements on the subject, and express himself more strongly on the benefits of Baptism, and therefore we have in these passages the most unexceptionable representation of his views. The conversation which then passed between him and Luther (in which the two parties came to an agreement on the doctrine of the Sacraments) throws considerable light on the views of both.

"When we were again assembled together in the morning, Doctor Luther proposed three things to us, as far as relates to baptism.

Since there are many who will not baptize infants; others also are found, who indeed permit them to be baptized, but maintain that baptism itself is only a naked sign, and therefore would suffer infants to die without baptism; others, lastly, baptize without water; therefore he thought that we ought to declare our belief on these points. But what he thought ought to be done, he explained beforehand, namely, that infants are to be baptized, and that that baptism is truly efficacious, and confers the adoption of the sons of God.* Lastly, that it ought to be administered with water, as they had written concerning these things in the Confession of Augsburg, the Apology, and elsewhere.

"To these things Bucer, agreeably to what we had arranged among ourselves should be proposed, replied, That we all had contended, and still contended, against the enemies of Pædobaptism, as our writings show. Moreover that baptism is held sacred by us, and that we teach concerning it, not as of some naked sign, but as of the true laver of regeneration, which (regeneration) is, through the power of God and the ministry of the minister, supplied to us with the water.† But that some are offended in that (since faith in Holy Scripture is received according to that which is heard, and comes to us through hearing, by the application of the word of God, according to the saying of Paul in the tenth of the Romans, 'faith cometh by hearing,') we with Augustine and other Fathers have said and written, that infants in that respect have not faith. But that if we will understand the word faith in a large sense, for any surrender of ourselves to God, in this sense even infants may be called faithful. For that we simply believe and teach, that true regeneration and true adoption into the sons of God are communicated to infants in baptism, and that the Holy Spirit works in them according to the measure and proportion given to them, as we read of St. John, that he was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb.‡ Yet lest we should fall into the *opus operatum* notion, that we are accustomed so to state these things, as to acknowledge that all this is the work of God only, but that the ministration only belongs to the minister. But that where there is any foundation in Scripture for what some affirm that infants when they are baptized *understand the words of the Gospel and actually believe them*, and thus are saved,—whence this can be proved from the sacred writings, we are unable as yet to see.

* Eamque esse vere efficacem et adoptionem filiorum Dei conferre.

† Præterea sacrum baptisma a nobis haberi, et de eo doceri, non ut de nudo aliquo symbolo, sed ut de vero lavacro regenerationis, quæ virtute Dei et ministerio ministri cum aqua nobis exhibetur.

‡ Nos enim simpliciter credere et docere, infantibus in baptismo veram regenerationem, veramque in filios Dei adoptionem communicari, et Spiritum Sanctum in illis operari juxta illis datam mensuram et modulum, &c.

"To these things Luther replied, that this was not the view of himself and his followers; but that as we, even when asleep, are numbered among the faithful, and are in truth such, although we are actually thinking nothing of God, so that a certain beginning of faith (*which nevertheless is the work of God*) *exists in infants*,* according to their measure and proportion, which we are ignorant of; and that he called this faith; and that he had rather that no questions should be moved concerning these things, and that no one should venture to search deeply into these things, to ascertain, that is, in what way *the Lord performs in them this his own work*.†

"Moreover to this that they had said, that baptism was necessary, Bucer replied thus.—That we by no means maintain that God has so tied salvation to baptism, that no one can obtain it unless he be baptized, and that all infants who are not baptized (so that baptism is not neglected through contempt) are to be held as damned, according to the opinion of some antient doctors; yet nevertheless that we exhort the people, that they bring all their infants to baptism. . . .

"To these things Doctor Luther and his followers assented, and were desirous that we should do this,—that we should admonish the people not to suffer their infants to grow up without baptism; for that they belong to the Church, and therefore that, as far as lies in our power, baptism is to be given to them: which we willingly undertook to do, as also beforetime we have faithfully contended against contempt of baptism in our sermons, and have faithfully exhorted all to offer their children for baptism, since baptism is truly the laver of regeneration and the communication of Christ's blood, which we religiously desire, and ought to desire, should be imparted to our children: yet nevertheless with the addition of an express declaration, that that is the work of Christ alone, who in performing it uses the external ministry of the Church, and the annexation of a warning against that old but yet too popular error among the Papists, when men seek the salvation of their children in the external work of baptism, but neither know, nor invoke, for the salvation of their children, the true Baptist, Christ. And so in these points also we came to an agreement."‡

We here see that both Luther (as we have already seen in the extract given from his Catechism) and Bucer held, that infants were to be baptized *because* they were faithful, that is, in the sense of having the principle of faith implanted in them by the mercy of God, not that baptism might first give it to them.

---

* Initium quoddam fidei (quod tamen Dei sit opus) in infantibus extare.
† Qua nimirum ratione hoc suum opus in ipsis Dominus perficiat.
‡ Buceri Scripta Anglicana. Basil 1577, fol. pp. 655, 656.

The possession of this gift of faith however by infants, was of course (as Luther speaks in his Catechism, and as we shall find Bucer stating) a matter of charitable hope; but (as Bucer expresses it in a passage which we shall quote presently) as we know that God works in the hearts of *some* children, it was felt by them, that it would be as absurd to deny children baptism because we know not in *which* of them God works, as to deny adults baptism, because, not being able to see the heart, we may baptize some hypocrites; and of *both*, acting in the spirit of hope and charity, they spoke as of those who were fit recipients, and therefore had the full benefit of baptism.

In the same year in which this Conference took place, Bucer published a second edition of his Commentary on the Four Gospels, in which he altered some passages which had occurred in the former relating to baptism, and inserted what he called a "retractation" conformable with the higher view of the benefit of baptism which he had maintained at the Conference at Wittenberg. In this "retractation" he explains why he had before hesitated to use the language which Luther and some others had applied to the Sacrament of Baptism, and adds, that, having agreed with him on the *sense* in which such language was to be used, he felt no further difficulty respecting it, and he lays down precisely his own view of the doctrine of baptism. These statements, therefore, are peculiarly adapted to show the sense in which these eminent Reformers used language respecting the Sacrament of Baptism which the Bishop of Exeter and others, unacquainted with their views, are strangely perverting to the support of doctrines to which they were strenuously opposed. I shall therefore add here some extracts from this work.

He remarks, then, that as the statements of Luther and others,

"That external words and sacraments were the certain seals, channels, and instruments of the grace of Christ, in which the Spirit of Christ is most certainly received, appeared to him to favour the error and superstition of those who seek salvation from outward ceremonies without true faith, it was his wish to vindicate as fully as possible to Christ the Lord, all remission of sins, relief of conscience, and participation of the Spirit of Christ, and diligently to teach that lesson, that we receive here by faith only what he bestows

and works for our salvation. And on this account we said, that ministers absolve from sins, when they pronounce men to be absolved through Christ, and that they confirm the consciences of men, and establish and advance their faith, when they proclaim that Christ confirms consciences and increases faith: that they *wash away sins by baptism and regenerate*, when by words and the sacred sprinkling they *represent and bear witness that Christ washes from sins*, and that they feed with the body and blood of the Lord, when in like manner by words and signs they proclaim that Christ himself nourishes us with himself. We described the principal use of baptism to be, *to be received into the Church, and make a profession of faith*; of the eucharist, that we should be reminded of our redemption, and profess our perseverance in faith and love. We never thought, nor wrote, that the signs are empty signs: on the contrary, in those very passages which I retract, I clearly testified that *Scripture speaks of the sacred signs* AS THEY ARE WHEN TRULY RECEIVED, IN WHICH CASE THE THING SIGNIFIED IS ANNEXED TO THE SIGN, AND THAT IS REALLY PERFORMED WHICH IS REPRESENTED BY THE SIGNS. It is not our view that the ministers do nothing, since, with Paul, we wrote, that they plant and water. This only we wished to urge, that without the power of Christ, by which he draws us to himself, the work of ministers, and moreover the words themselves and external signs administered, cannot bring salvation to any one. In these things any one may see that there is nothing contrary to piety; but, as I have said, they are so written that they may be twisted so as to be made use of for lowering the sacred ministry below its proper place. I confess therefore first, that I have not sufficiently explained the authority of God, and the true benefit in the Word and Sacraments, in not carefully inculcating that truth, that Christ uses the minister as his organ, that above all things he may set forth in his Word and Sacraments the remission of sins and communion with himself, and that the *true profit in these things is*, if the minister as diligently as possible commends this exhibition, and the others *embrace it by a true faith*. The profession of religion is here secondary. For *faith precedes the profession of faith*, and the preaching of the mercy of God and the redemption of Christ, which is the object of faith, precedes faith. Moreover the symbols in the Sacraments are nothing but visible words, by which the preaching and offering of the grace of Christ becomes more influential and more effectual to rouse the mind. Further, I acknowledge, that these metaphors, that the Sacraments are instruments, organs, and channels of grace, are agreeable to the Scriptures. For St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, 'I have begotten you by the Gospel,' 1 Cor. iv. In 2 Cor. iii. he writes that he had administered

to them the Spirit, not the letter, and that he had made them an epistle of Christ. To the Galatians he writes, that he had received the Spirit by the hearing of faith. *Hence* he called baptism the laver of regeneration, and the eucharist the communion of the body and blood of Christ. He affirms that by baptism we are buried into the death of Christ, incorporated into Christ, and have put on Christ. From all which, as it is evident, that the Gospel and the Sacraments, which are as it were visible Gospels, were instituted by Christ the Lord for this purpose, that he might communicate to us through them his own redemption; so it is very clear, that these are to the Lord to a certain extent instruments and channels of his Spirit and grace, and thus that there is nothing absurd in these metaphorical expressions; if only this is carefully pointed out for observation, that ministers and the ministry are such instruments of our salvation that they have nothing of it, nor supply anything, in themselves, but only so much of it as Christ, using them *according to his own spontaneous mercy, condescends to give and supply through them.* And in this way we ourselves have never denied, that the words and Sacraments of the Gospels are Christ's *organs*, by which he gives us the benefit of his redemption. This only we deny, as we have clearly expressed it, that Sacraments and sacred words are *such instruments and channels of grace as that they bring salvation with whatever mind or faith you partake of them.* For some have so tied the grace of Christ to them, that these external things seem of themselves to work salvation, even though the mind never seriously raises itself to Christ, so that the superstition of the common people, who are yet ignorant of the true faith of Christ, rests in these things.

"Moreover, as they seemed to us so to speak of the word and Sacraments of the Gospel, that we considered that there was danger from their words lest that superstition of the common people should either be strengthened, where it still cleaves, or be brought back where it has been driven out; so they in their turn, when we, desirous of guarding, lest any one should seek salvation for himself from ceremonies, without certain faith in Christ, wrote that Christ bestows his grace and Spirit according to his will upon whom and when he pleases, and that what is performed by man can effect nothing of this, thought that we attributed nothing else to the Sacraments than that they are external marks of our communion in Christ, and that we did not acknowledge that they are symbols of grace, and that grace is given through them. But the Lord has now granted, that both they should acknowledge that we, and we that they, think and teach that respecting the word and Sacraments that Scripture delivers, namely, that they are effectual signs and organs of communion with Christ, that is, of our salvation, by which the Lord bestows upon us com-

munion with himself; but that *according to the good will of the Father and his own compassion towards us,* with no merit of any creature; on which account *they require faith.* Therefore each error is excluded on both sides, both of those who seek salvation for themselves from ceremonies without faith in Christ, and of those who so pretend that they seek salvation for themselves from Christ, that they hold in small estimation the sacred ministry of the Church."*

From this passage Bucer's general view of the doctrine of the Sacraments is very apparent, and we see from it, that he has no hesitation in speaking of the Sacraments as Christ's organs and channels of divine grace; but then, when he uses this language, *he uses it, as he maintains that Scripture uses it, not as applicable to every case in which they are administered, but to those only in which God of his free mercy pleases to use them as his instruments for that end, in the case of parties whom he has made fit recipients.* He is quite ready to maintain with the Bishop of Exeter himself, that God has appointed them as instruments in the use of which he conveys grace to the soul, but not indiscriminately to all that use them. And it is by confounding these two things, which are wholly distinct from one another, and interpreting general statements of the purpose and effects of baptism, where spiritually efficient, as if they were intended to apply to every case where baptism is received, (at least in the case of infants), that the Bishop of Exeter has quoted, as supporting his view, men who would have held it in abhorrence.

It may be well, however, to add some other passages from Bucer; and I shall first give those which speak generally of the benefits of baptism, in order to show how strong may be the general terms used on this subject by those who at the same time carefully limited the beneficial effects of baptism to recipients of a certain character.

Thus, then, in his Letter to Dr. Fox, Bishop of Hereford, prefixed to the work from which I have just quoted, he states that his doctrine is, that—

"Christ truly washes from their sins and regenerates those upon whom the Church bestows baptism, which is in fact the laver of rege-

* Buceri Enarr. in. Evang. Basil. 1536. fol. pp. 43, 44. It seems unnecessary to give the whole of this long passage in the original.

neration."* "*Since we ought to speak of the Word and Sacraments, as the Lord has commended them to his Church, and wishes them to be used, I some time since acknowledged, and re-assert, that it is rightly said of the Word and Sacraments,* WHEN WE SPEAK SIMPLY OF THEM, *that they are the administration of salvation, channels, vehicles, and instruments of the Spirit and grace.*"† "We shall then speak most fully, clearly, and certainly concerning these points of faith, when we speak according to the rule and form of the Scriptures. Now therein the Lord clearly says, that his Gospel is his power for salvation to every one that believes, that baptism is the laver of regeneration, that the eucharist is the communication of his body and blood, that his ministers bind and loose, retain sins and remit them; why therefore should not we also speak thus?"‡

And in the work itself he says, that "by baptism we are said to be loosed and washed from our sins, because by baptism, through the power of Christ and the ministry of the Church, we receive pardon and cleansing," &c. :§ and he calls the laver of water in baptism "a true and exhibitive sign ;"|| and says that in baptism "the renewal of the Spirit is exhibited and received."¶

"Nor will they be offended," he says, "if any Scriptures seem to attribute justification to baptism; for they will observe that Scripture ascribes to those Sacramental signs what belongs to the thing signified. For they are exhibitive signs; and when it speaks of signs *truly received, in which case that which the signs signify is present together with them,* it is in the habit of joining the internal things with the external, that is, the sign and the thing signified, and thus to speak of them unitedly."**

---

* Peccatis vere abluere, et regignere, quibus illa baptisma, quod nimirum lavacrum regenerationis est, impertit. Epist. ad Ed. Fox. prefix. ad Enarr. in Evang. p. 6.

† At quia de verbo et sacramentis loquendum est, ut ea Dominus Ecclesiæ suæ commendavit et usurpari vult, pridem agnosco, et confirmo, recte dici de verbis et sacramentis, cum simpliciter de illis loquimur, esse ea administrationem salutis, canales, vehicula et instrumenta Spiritus et gratiæ. Ib. p. 7. ‡ Ib.

§ Baptismate dicimur peccatis solvi et ablui, quia baptismate, virtute Christi et Ecclesiæ ministerio, solutionem et ablutionem percipimus. p. 41.

|| Signo vero et exhibitivo. p. 42.

¶ Spiritus renovatio exhibetur atque percipitur. Ib.

** Neque offendentur, si quæ Scripturæ videantur baptismo justificationem tribuere; animadvertent enim Scripturam signis istis sacramentalibus adscribere quod signati est. Sunt enim signa exhibitiva, eumque de signis in veritate perceptis loquatur, quo pacto simul adest quod significant, solet interna simul cum externis, hoc est, signum et signatum conjungere, atque ita junctim ea prædicare. Id. ib. p. 42.

From these passages we may see, that Bucer had no hesitation in using the strongest language as to the benefit of baptism, when enunciating in general terms its nature and effects. And they show us also, *with what views the Reformers used language, on several points, which from its ambiguity and capability of diverse interpretations, has been since their time the cause of so much contention in the Church.*

But, while the Sacrament of Baptism is spoken of by him in these terms, in consequence of the end it is appointed to answer where God's blessing accompanies it, the question as to the parties in whom that end is accomplished, is not touched by that general statement. What Bucer's answer to this question would have been, is sufficiently apparent from what I have already quoted; but I will add one or two passages still more explicit on this point.

"From that saying, 'I never knew you,' that is, acknowledged you among mine, we are clearly taught, that those *who can at any time fall away from Christ, never were Christ's,* and never truly believed on him, or were pious, *never obtained the spirit of sons.* . . . Moreover, as the reprobate were never known to Christ, so the elect were never unknown."*

"'My sheep hear my voice.' In these words he clearly teaches, that *all things depend upon the Divine election,* and that those to whom it has *once been given to be sheep can never perish.* For here we are told, that they only hear the voice of Christ, that is, *receive faith,* who are sheep.† Whence now will it be, that some are sheep, that is, capable of receiving the doctrine of Christ, others not at all so? Doubtless because the former are inspired with the good Spirit of God, the latter not at all. . . . But whence will it be, that the former have the gift of the Spirit, the latter have not? Truly no otherwise than that the former are ordained to life, the latter are not; that the former are given to the Son to be saved, the latter by no

---

* Ex illo, Nunquam novi vos, id est, inter meos agnovi, clare docemur, qui aliquando a Christo possunt excidere, eos Christi nunquam fuisse, eoque nunquam vere credidisse, aut fuisse pios, nunquam spiritum filiorum fuisse nactos . . . . Proinde ut Christo nunquam noti sunt reprobi, ita nunquam ignoti electi. Id. ib. in Matt. c. 7. p. 203.

† In his aperte docet, omnia a Divina electione pendere, eosque quibus semel datum fuerit oves esse, perire nunquam posse. Hic nunque audimus, eos tantum vocem Christi audire, id est, fidem recipere, qui oves sint.

means. To the Lord therefore let us give this glory, that he bestows the Spirit, in no degree aided by our labour."*

"Whence, indeed, we, who cannot reject any from the grace of Christ except the deniers of it, ought not only to permit, but also to exhort, that all children indiscriminately should be brought to the Lord, that is, offered to his Church, because that which he himself commands cannot but be best? If they already belong to the Church, and theirs is the kingdom of heaven, why should we deny them the sign of Baptism, by which they who belong to the Church of Christ are in the habit of being received into it? *If there are any goats among them, they will then be to be excluded by us, when they shall have shown themselves to be so.* Meanwhile let us not be more scrupulous than Christ, who pronounced children indiscriminately brought to him to be citizens of the kingdom of heaven, and on that account was angry that they were driven away from him, and ordered them to be brought to him, and when brought took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them and blessed them. By so many signs he wished to show that they belonged to him, and were by no means to be shut out of the kingdom of heaven. And since by far the greater number are snatched hence in childhood, who, I make no doubt, are saved by the mercy of Christ, especially those born of believers, I believe that the Lord wished in this place [Matt. xix. 14] to signify, that no period of human life gave more citizens to the kingdom of heaven."†

"Moreover, from the fact that infants are destitute of faith, nothing less follows than that, as some think, they therefore cannot please God or be holy. Since John the Baptist is said to have been full of the Holy Ghost from the womb (Luke i.); the child is not said to have been endued with faith, and yet he was great in the sight of the Lord. For God leads his own as is suitable to the age and condition of each. Faith ought to proclaim the glory of God, and to be efficacious through love; and as these things do not belong to infants, what if also they have not faith, being nevertheless marked for salvation by the Spirit of God. But as to what they object from the last chapter of Mark, 'He that believeth not, shall be condemned,' they show that they have not rightly weighed that passage. For there a command of Christ precedes concerning preaching the Gospel in the whole world, and then it is added, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned;' which is as much as to say, he that has faith in the Gospel preached by you and shall confess it by baptism, shall be saved, but he that has not shall be damned. And thus this sentence by no means applies to

* Id. ib. in Joann. c. x. p. 716. † Id. ib. in Matt. c. xix. p. 403.

those who have not heard the Gospel. Therefore, WITH ELECT INFANTS THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD IS PRESENT, by which, so far as suffices for their age and condition, they are led; and when they grow up, at the time ordained by the Father, it teaches them to believe the word of God, and leads them by faith to salvation.* But they who depart hence before they grow up, since they are Christ's, they shall also be with him, and be happy, and that with the bestowal of the beatific knowledge of God," &c.†

And he maintains that those who are not thus elect, but are "goats and vessels of wrath" ("hœdi et vasa iræ,") grow up and lose the simplicity of children, and thus are shut out from the kingdom of heaven.‡

Now Bucer, holding these views, is earnestly invited by Archbishop Cranmer to come over to this country as a teacher of theology, hailed as a most sound and able divine, and placed by Cranmer in the Chair of the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge.§ In this post he publicly defended the same views as those maintained in the extracts I have just given from his Commentaries on the Gospels. Thus in a public Disputation with some Romish divines at Cambridge in 1550, he says,—

"For those that are Christ's sheep cannot perish, and they have eternal life; and he cannot sin and err perseveringly and finally (for every holy person falls into sin and prays for the pardon of sin) whosoever truly believes in Christ, and is therefore *regenerate in him*."¶

And one of his theses being, "The Canonical books alone abundantly teach the regenerate all things which are necessary for salvation," he remarks,—

"But in adding the word 'regenerate,' I have done it on this ac-

---

* Adest itaque electis infantibus Spiritus Domini, quo, quantum ad ipsorum ætatem et conditionem satis est, aguntur; iidem cum adolescunt, tempore a Patre definito, ad credendum Dei verbo eos erudit, fideque ad salutem perducit.

† Id. ib. in Matt. c. xix. p. 404.

‡ Qui vero hœdi sunt, et vasa iræ, ii ut adolescentes alios animos assumunt, ita tales non perseverant, et regni cœlorum redduntur extorres. Ib. p. 403.

§ See pp. 58 et seq. above.

¶ Nec enim possunt perire quæ oves Christi sunt, et habent vitam æternam, peccareque et errare perseveranter et finaliter (in peccata labitur enim, et pro peccatorum venia orat omnis sanctus) non potest, *quicunque* vere credit Christo, eoque *est in eo regenitus*. Disput. Cant. hab. Inter Scripta Anglicana, p. 787.

count, because they who are not *born again of God*, and endued with the Spirit of God, neither can hear nor understand what the Scriptures teach."*

In the same year (1550) he lectured upon the Epistle to the Ephesians, and in his Lectures on the 4th chapter treated particularly on the virtue and use of the sacred ministry, in which lectures he observes:

"From these things therefore it is readily acknowledged, that every true Church of God consists only of *the regenerate*, but nevertheless has for the most part among them *in external communion in sacred things those that are* NOT REGENERATE, but their true character concealed, if so be that Christ's discipline flourishes as it ought."† "Hence [i. e. from 1 John iii. 14] it is plain, that the *true members* of the Church are *alone regenerated*."‡

And proceeding in these lectures to speak expressly "of the force and efficacy of baptism," while he distinctly lays down regeneration as its effect, and maintains this to be the meaning of such passages as John iii. 5, Eph. v. 26, Tit. iii. 5, he as distinctly *limits* this effect to "the elect."§

And in his elaborate work "Concerning the Kingdom of Christ," addressed to Edward VI., and written about this period,

---

* Canonici libri docent soli abunde renatos quæ sint saluti omnia. . . . . Quod autem adjeci (renatos) id ideo feci, quod qui non sunt *renati ex Deo* et Spiritu Dei prædíti, ea quæ Scripturæ docent, nec audire possunt, nec intelligere. Joh. viii. & x. 1 Cor. iii. Ib. p. 713.

† Ex his itaque facile cognoscitur, omnem ecclesiam veram Dei constare tantum renatis; habere tamen plerumque inter se in communione externa sacrorum non renatos, sed latentes, siquidem vigeat Christi disciplina ut debet. Explic. de vi et usu S. Minist. ib. p. 558; where the portion of the Lectures which treats on this subject is reprinted. The Lectures on the whole Epistle were printed in 1562, under the following title,—Prælectiones doctiss. in Epist. D. P. ad Ephesios, eximii doctoris D. Martini Buceri, habitæ Cantabrigiæ in Anglia a. 1550 et 1551. Basil. 1562, fol. ed. Imman. Tremell.—The reader may be glad also to know that a portion of these Lectures on the 4th chapter is inserted in the "Scripta Anglicana" (pp. 504—538) which is not to be found in the "Prælectiones."

‡ Hinc itaque planum est, vera Ecclesiæ membra esse tantum renatos. Ib. p. 560. See also p. 572, and 592, 593.

§ Ex his jam omnibus locis clare perspicimus baptisma commendari nobis, ut instrumentum divinæ misericordiæ, quo Deus non sua sed nostra causa dignatur uti, ut quo *electis suis, quibus ipse hæc sua destinavit dona*, conferat. . . . regenerationem, &c. . . . Nec minus efficax est horum omnium donorum Dei instrumentum baptisma *electis Dei, quos eo statuit Dominus sibi regignere*, quam est ullum remedium. . . . &c. ad conferendam sanitatem corpori. Ib. p. 598. See the whole of pages 595—598.

he says,—"For men ought by baptism to be cleansed from their sins, to be regenerated, and renewed to eternal life, to be incorporated into Christ the Lord, and clothed with him; *all which things belong to none but the saints and those elected to eternal life.*"*

Such were the views firmly and clearly maintained by Bucer, while enjoying the patronage of Archbishop Cranmer. And as we have already seen, he obtained, on his death, the testimony of one who was to be Cranmer's Protestant successor (Archbishop Parker), that for the soundness and excellence of his doctrine, as well as the holiness of his life, he was a burning and shining light in the Church;† and at a subsequent period was spoken of by Archbishop Whitgift as "so reverent, so learned, so painful, so *sound* a father."‡

Two circumstances which add greatly to the importance of this case are, that there is a Baptismal Service extant drawn up by Bucer on the same principle as our own; and that our own Prayer-book having been submitted to him by Cranmer for his judgment, he approved of our Baptismal Service. But these are matters which I shall in a future chapter fully place before the reader.

§ 2.—*The Doctrine of Peter Martyr.*

The similar position held at Oxford, through Archbishop Cranmer's means, by Peter Martyr, renders it of equal importance to us, in our present inquiry, to ascertain his views upon the subject.

And in the case of one whose general views are so well known, it seems hardly necessary to give a large body of extracts from his writings. But the important question is, What did he teach from the chair of divinity at Oxford? As Regius Professor he read lectures on the Epistle to the Romans and the First to the Corinthians, which he afterwards published.

* Baptismate enim homines debent peccatis ablui, regigni, et innovari ad vitam æternam, Christo Domino incorporari, eo indui: quæ omnia non sunt nisi sanctorum et ad vitam æternam electorum. De Regno Christi, lib. 1. c. 7. Inter Script. Anglic. p. 38.

† See p. 64 above. ‡ See p. 65 above.

Let us observe, then, what doctrine he delivered in them on this point.

And first let us notice his *general* statements as to the benefit of baptism. This is his definition of it; that it is—

"A Sacrament instituted by the Lord, consisting of water and the word, *by which we are regenerated* and engrafted into Christ, for the remission of sins and eternal salvation. Water is a symbol peculiarly appropriate to it. For as by it the filth of the body is cleansed, so by this Sacrament the soul is purified."* "Baptism is nothing else but the Sacrament of regeneration, consisting of water and the Spirit through the word of God, from which we have remission of sins and eternal life according to the promise of Christ. . . . We draw the conclusion from this place [1 Cor. xii. 12], that by baptism we are most truly joined to Christ, not less than by the Eucharist. . . . Reason teaches us that baptism produces it more efficaciously than the Eucharist, just as we obtain more by our birth than by nourishment or food."†

Such are his statements, left unhesitatingly, without any qualification in the context, as to the benefits of baptism. But did he mean that all who were baptized, either in the case of adults or infants, derived these blessings from baptism? Nothing of the kind; as other passages distinctly show. He spoke of baptism as what it is when it avails to the purposes for which it was intended; not when it is received in vain. With the passages just quoted we must connect such as the following;—

Commenting upon Rom. ix. 8, he says—

"This passage declares, that what has been before promised generally was restrained by the secret election of God to certain men in particular. . . . In the same way it happens at this day respecting the

* Sacramentum a Domino institutum, ex aqua et verbo constans, quo regeneramur, et Christo inserimur, ad remissionem peccatorum et æternam salutem. Aqua symbolum est illi quam appositissimum. Nam sicut ea sordes corporis abluuntur, ita per hoc Sacramentum lustratur animus. (Pet. Mart. in 1 Cor. i. 17. Ed. Tigur. 1567. fol. 10.)

† Baptismum primo loco ponit, qui nihil est aliud, quam sacramentum regenerationis, constans ex aqua et Spiritu per verbum Dei, ex quo habemus remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam juxta promissionem Christi. . . . Elicitur ex hoc loco, nos per baptismum Christo verissime conjungi, nec minus quam per eucharistiam. . . . ratio docet, baptismum id efficacius præstare quam eucharistiam, sicut per generationem plus adipiscimur, quam alimento seu cibo. (Id. ib. xii. 12. fol. 178, 179.)

children of the faithful. We have a promise, that God is willing not only to be our God but also the God of our seed; which promise being indefinite is applied to infants by the secret election of God, not indeed always to all, but to *some certain ones in particular, according as it shall seem fit to God's purpose. And since this is unknown to us, and we ought to follow the outward word which is committed to the Church, under that promise we baptize our little ones as the antients circumcised theirs.* The Anabaptists blame us for doing so; because we know nothing concerning the spirit, nor the faith, nor the election of those little ones. But we do not think those things of any weight in the matter; we only regard the word of God which is offered to us in the form of a general and indefinite promise. But we commit its fulfilment to God, since we cannot judge respecting his election. But let them in their turn tell us, how they baptize adults, when it is uncertain whether they belong to the election, and whether what they say they believe and profess, they truly say, and come to Christ with a sincere mind. Here they can answer nothing except that they follow the confession of faith which adults make before the Church when they are to be baptized. But since they may easily be deceived in that confession, and cannot know anything for certain either concerning their state of mind or concerning their election, there is no reason why they should find fault with us. *For the same thing altogether happens to us in the case of little ones who are offered to the Church to be baptized, which happens to them in the case of adults.*"*

* Hic locus [Rom. ix. 8] declarat, id quod antea promissum fuerat generaliter, per arcanam Dei electionem ad quosdam singulares homines revocari. . . . Eodem modo hodie usu venit de liberis fidelium. Habemus promissionem, Deum velle, non tantùm nostrum esse Deum, verum etiam seminis nostri: quæ promissio cum sit indefinita, arcana Dei electione infantibus applicatur: non quidem semper omnibus, sed certis quibusdam, prout divino proposito visum fuerit. Quod quum nos lateat, sequi autem debeamus externum verbum, quod commendatum est Ecclesiæ, sub ea promissione parvulos nostros baptizamus, quemadmodum suos veteres circumcidebant. Id factum Anabaptistæ reprehendunt, quod neque de spiritu, neque de fide, neque de electione illorum parvulorum nobis quicquam constet. Verum nos ista nihil moramur: tantùm respicimus verbum Dei, quod in generali atque indefinita promissione nobis offertur. Executionem autem ejus Deo committimus, cum de illius electione non possimus judicare. Sed illi vicissim nobis dicant, quanam ratione tingant adultos, quum incertum sit, an illi pertineant ad electionem, et utrum, quæ dicunt se credere ac profiteri, vere dicant, et sincero animo ad Christum accedant. Hic nihil possunt respondere, nisi se sequi confessionem fidei quam adulti faciunt coram Ecclesia cum sint baptizandi. Verum cum ea confessione facile possint decipi, neque aut de animo illorum, aut de electione aliquid certo sciant, nihil est, quod nos accusent. Idem enim prorsus nobis accidit in parvulis, qui offeruntur Ecclesiæ baptizandi, quod illis in adultis. (Pet. Mart. in Rom. ix. 8. Ed. Basil. 1559. 8vo. pp. 788—790.)

A more distinct recognition of the hypothetical principle, that is, of acting on the supposition that the party concerned is a true child of God, when there is no evidence to the contrary, (both in the case of adults and infants) could not be penned.

I will add, however, one more passage.

"Wherefore we may conclude from these words, that as formerly circumcision was given to infants, so now baptism cannot be denied them; for if they have the thing, what reason is there why they should not have the sign? And lest you should doubt whether circumcision and baptism are equal and have the same purpose, Paul shews this most manifestly in his Epistle to the Colossians, where he calls baptism the circumcision of Christ. And they who lay it down, that the infants of the Hebrews ought to be circumcised, but that ours ought not to be baptized, make God more just to the Jews than to Christians. Some inquire, why, when we are ignorant whether infants have the reality of the Sacrament, we give them the sign, and seal that which is uncertain to us. To whom we reply, that this question is alleged not against us, but against the word of God. For he clearly commanded and willed that children should be circumcised. Then further let them tell us, why they admit adults to baptism or the communion, when they are uncertain of their state of mind. For they who are baptized or communicate, may pretend to be what they are not, and deceive the Church. They reply that they hold their profession to be sufficient. If they speak falsely, what is that to us, they say? they must look to that themselves. So we say concerning infants; that it is sufficient for us that they are offered to the Church, either by their parents, or by those in whose power they are. *But if election and predestination concur with the administration of the Sacrament, what we do is ratified; if not, it is useless.* For our salvation depends upon the election and mercy of God. But of the former, since to us it is hidden, we judge nothing. We only follow those indications which we can have respecting it, such as these, that young children are brought to the Church to be baptized, and that those of maturer years profess in words that they believe Christ; which marks, although they are not so certain that they cannot deceive, yet they are sufficient for us for making them partakers of the Sacraments."*

* Quare licet ex his concludere, sicut olim circumcisio dabatur infantibus, ita nunc baptismum eisdem negari non posse: nam si rem habent, quæ ratio est, cur signum habere non possint? Et ne dubites, num circumcisio et baptismus paria sint, et eandem habeant rationem, Paulus hoc apertissime demonstrat ad Colossenses, quo in loco baptismum appellat cir-

It is, I suppose, clear enough what doctrine is delivered in these passages. And we have already seen what Cranmer's opinion was of their author.*

In this case, also, as in that of Bucer, we shall find hereafter, that, while publicly maintaining these views, Peter Martyr gave his approval to our Baptismal Service.

---

cumcisionem Christi. Et qui statuunt, Hebræorum infantes debuisse circumcidi, nostros vero non posse baptizari, Deum faciunt æquiorem Judæis quam Christianis. Quærunt nonnulli, quum nesciamus, utrum infantes rem sacramenti habeant, cur apponamus signum, et id quod nobis incertum sit obsignemus. Quibus respondemus, hanc quæstionem non contra nos adduci, sed contra verbum Dei. Is enim diserte præcepit, et voluit, ut pueri circumciderentur. Deinde respondeant ipsi nobis, cur adultos ad baptismum aut communionem admittant, cum de animo illorum sint incerti. Etenim qui baptizantur, aut communicant, possunt simulare ac Ecclesiam decipere. Respondent satis esse eorum habere professionem. Si mentiuntur, quid hoc ad nos, inquiunt; ipsi viderint. Ita nos dicimus de infantibus, nobis esse satis, quod Ecclesiæ offerantur, vel a parentibus, vel ab illis in quorum sunt potestate. *Quod si cum actione sacramenti electio et prædestinatio concurrat, ratum est quod agimus; sin minus, irritum.* Salus enim nostra pendet ab electione ac misericordia Dei. De illa vero, cum nobis occulta sit, nihil judicamus. Ea tantum sequimur indicia, quæ habere de illa possumus, qualia sunt, quod pueri infantes offeruntur Ecclesiæ baptizandi, quodque adultiores verbis confitentur se Christo credere; quæ indicia etsi non adeo certa sint, ut fallere non possint, nobis tamen satis sunt ad sacramenta conferenda. (Id. ib. iv. 11. p. 260.)

* See pp. 54—58, above.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE WORKS ISSUED BY PUBLIC AUTHORITY IN THE LATTER PART OF THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII., AND THEIR DOCTRINE ON THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM IN INFANTS.

It is a favourite practice with what may be called the retrograde school in our Church, to refer to the works published in the very *dawn* of the Reformation among us, as evidence what is the present doctrine of our Church. Such a fact cannot fail, I should suppose, of itself, to excite some suspicion in the mind of the reader, as to the character of the views of those who make their appeal to the works of men but half emancipated (as Cranmer afterwards confessed of himself) from the errors of Romanism.

But the reference being so frequently made, and made as if it was to works of some degree of authority in our Church, it is well to meet it. I must first premise, however, that not one iota of authority can now belong to the works published under the sanction of Crown or Clergy, or both united, in the reign of Henry VIII. This is too obvious to need proof. In fact, almost the only bearing which I can conceive them to have upon the question of the meaning of our present Formularies, is derived from the fact of Cranmer's connexion with them. So far as he was concerned in them, so far it may be thought, that where he can be proved to have remained of the same mind at a subsequent period, when engaged in drawing up our present Formularies, *there* they may be legitimately *referred to*, as adding to the probability of the correctness of any interpretation of those Formularies they may favour.

But considering the extent of the change which Cranmer himself tells us (in passages which I shall quote presently) his mind experienced, the *onus* of proof that his views on *any* subject connected with the differences between the Romish and Protestant churches remained the same, lies upon those who assert it.

The chief of these documents are, the "Articles about Religion," in 1536, the "Institution of a Christian Man," in 1537, and "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," in 1543, which was founded upon the "Institution," but varied *greatly* from it, and (as I shall show) was only tolerated, and not approved, by Cranmer. These three works were republished a few years since by Dr. Lloyd, then Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, who, in his Preface, makes the following remarks:—

"It is needless to observe, that these documents *cannot pretend to any authority in the present day. Nothing antecedent to the reign of Edward VI. has any title to that character.* It was then only that the errors of Popery were formally renounced, and the pure doctrines of Protestantism authoritatively established in this kingdom. In these Formularies, accordingly, many of the tenets of Romanism are to be found, which, in the succeeding reign, on a closer examination of Scripture, and under the exercise of an unfettered liberty of judgment, afforded by the more fortunate circumstances of that reign, were discarded as erroneous."——"On these points [*i. e.* "*all* those points in which the positive doctrines of Popery were immediately concerned"] undoubtedly, the free expression of Cranmer's sentiments was *impeded and overruled.*"

Of the "Necessary Erudition" he observes,—

"I think it is truly said by Collyer, that it 'manages with less latitude than the Institution, bends to the six Articles, and, in some points of controversy, drives further into the doctrines of the Roman Communion.' It is probable that Gardiner had greater influence in the preparation of this work than in either of the former."*

To these three documents, which were issued by public authority, may be added what Dr. Jenkyns calls the "Articles agreed upon by Cranmer with the German Reformers in 1538," but their authorship and object are uncertain.

* Pref. pp. iv., v. and viii.

It is quite clear, then, at the outset, that such documents can afford us no trustworthy evidence as to the meaning of the Formularies drawn up from twelve to sixteen years later, in the next reign, when the whole aspect of things was changed.

And it may be well, before we proceed further, to give the reader some specimens of their theology.*

The following are from the Articles of 1536:—

"*The Sacrament of Penance.* . . . That by penance and such good works of the same, we shall not only obtain everlasting life, but also we shall deserve remission or mitigation of these present pains and afflictions in this world." (p. xxiv.)

"*The Sacrament of the Altar.* Fourthly, as touching the Sacrament of the Altar, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must constantly believe, that under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the cross for our redemption; and that under the same form and figure of bread and wine the very self-same body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of all them which receive the said Sacrament." (p. xxv.)

"*Justification.* . . . That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared." (p. xxvi.)

Among the "Articles concerning the laudable Ceremonies used in the Church," it may be sufficient to notice the following.—

Of "images," it is stated that "it is meet that they should stand in the churches," "especially the images of Christ and our Lady," though their worship is prohibited. (p. xxviii.)

"*Of praying to Saints.* As touching praying to saints, we will that all Bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that albeit grace, remission of sin, and salvation, cannot be obtained but of God only by the mediation of our Saviour Christ, which is only sufficient Mediator for our sins; yet *it is very laudable to pray to saints in heaven ever-*

* I quote from Bp. Lloyd's edition, entitled, Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the reign of Henry viii. Oxf. 1825. 8vo.

lastingly living, whose charity is ever permanent, *to be intercessors, and to pray for us and with us,* unto Almighty God after this manner: All holy angels and saints in heaven pray for us and with us unto the Father, that for his dear son Jesu Christ's sake, we may have grace of him and remission of our sins." (p. xxix.)

"*Of Rites and Ceremonies.* As concerning the rites and ceremonies of Christ's Church, as . . . . sprinkling of holy water . . . . bearing of candles on Candlemas-day, in memory of Christ the spiritual Light . . . . giving of ashes on Ash Wednesday . . . . creeping to the cross and humbling ourselves to Christ on Good Friday before the cross . . . . and kissing of it in memory of our redemption by Christ made upon the cross; setting up the sepulture of Christ. . . . the hallowing of the font, and other like exorcisms and benedictions by the ministers of Christ's Church; and *all other like laudable customs, rites, and ceremonies,* be not to be contemned and cast away, but to be *used and continued as things good and laudable,* to put us in remembrance of those spiritual things that they do signify." (pp. xxx., xxxi.)

"*Of Purgatory.* Forasmuch as due order of charity requireth, and the Book of Maccabees, and divers ancient doctors plainly shew, that it is a very good and a charitable deed to pray for souls departed . . . we will that all Bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people . . . that it standeth with the very due order of charity, a Christian man to pray for souls departed, and to commit them in our prayers to God's mercy, and also to cause other to pray for them in masses and exequies, and to give alms to other to pray for them, whereby they may be relieved and holpen of some part of their pain," &c. (p. xxxi.)

All these passages, with the exception of that on praying to saints, are repeated,* without, I may say, the slightest alteration, (the only difference being in two or three little words that do not affect the sense,) in the "Institution of a Christian Man;" where also we find long disquisitions on the value and importance of each of the *seven* Sacraments.

Now this work, i. e. the "Institution," drawn up by a body of Bishops and Divines, with Cranmer at their head, is no doubt an important testimony as to his views *at that time.* In his letter to Cromwell, enclosing his Annotations upon the King's correc-

* See pp. 99, 100, 135, 147, 209, 210. The passages on images and rites and ceremonies, in pp. 135, 147, occur in the explication of the second and fourth commandments.

tions of this work, he speaks of it as "the book lately devised *by me*, and other Bishops of this realm."* And we see from the quotations just given, how far he was from being emancipated from the errors of Popery; perhaps, to a considerable extent, kept back by those with whom he was associated. But I must add, that there is a great deal of decided Protestant statement on other points, such as we should hardly perhaps have expected from his pen at this time, as I have already shown. (p. 40 et s. above.) And this, notwithstanding the opposition which (as we learn from Fox's MS. Life of Cranmer, quoted by Strype†,) he had to encounter from Gardiner Bishop of Winchester, and some others.

In the Articles called by Dr. Jenkyns, "Articles agreed upon by Cranmer with the German Reformers in 1538," the Article on Justification is sound, but the doctrine of that on the Eucharist, which I subjoin, remains the same :—

"De eucharistia constanter credimus et docemus, quod in sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini vere, substantialiter, et realiter adsunt corpus et sanguis Christi sub speciebus panis et vini; et quod sub eisdem speciebus vere et realiter exhibentur et distribuuntur illis qui sacramentum accipiunt, sive bonis sive malis."‡

The difference between the Article on Justification in these Articles, and the statement on that subject in the "Institution," is remarkable, as showing the progress of truth in Cranmer's mind; and, in that respect, his Annotations upon the King's proposed corrections of the Institution on this subject are worth attention.§

The next work to be noticed is, "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," published in 1543, and commonly called the King's Book, from its having been revised and "set forth" by the King, with the sanction of Parliament; whereas the "Institution" was published by a body of divines headed by the Archbishops and Bishops, with a Preface addressed to the King.‖ And here we see at once a decided retrogressive

* Strype's Cranmer, p. 51; or i. 73. Oxf. ed.
† Life of Cranmer, p. 51; or i. 73. Oxf. ed.
‡ Cranmer's Works, P. S. ed. ii. p. 475.
§ Works, ii. 113, 114.
‖ The "Institution" is said by Collyer (ii. 130) to have been "composed in Convocation," but I cannot find upon what authority he asserts this.

movement towards Romish doctrine. Not only is all the objectionable matter inserted in the "Institution" retained here, but much that was valuable in that Work, especially the important Paraphrase on the Creed, is struck out, and unsatisfactory doctrine substituted for it; and, on all the important points, the statements made are changed materially in favour of Romish views.

This is especially observable in the Article on Justification, which is the more remarkable, because the statement on this subject in the Articles of 1538 (or perhaps 1540,) was sound. But the fact is, that Cranmer was completely overruled with respect to this work, and therefore it is perfectly useless for ascertaining his views even at that time. How little power he had to prevent the issue, by Royal or Parliamentary authority, of Articles of Religion of which he disapproved, is manifest by the Act of the Six Articles, (as it is called), passed in 1539, and which was enacted against his strong and earnest remonstrances;* but to which, as in the case of the "Necessary Doctrine," he felt himself compelled to submit.

And shortly after the accession of Edward VI., in 1547, he openly avowed what his opinion had been respecting the "Necessary Doctrine," and charged Gardiner, the Popish Bishop of Winchester, with having "seduced" the King with respect to it. We learn this from Gardiner's answer to Cranmer's letter to him containing this statement, remaining among Fox's MSS., and printed by Strype;† in which Gardiner says, "It grieveth me much to read written from your Grace in the beginning of your letters, how the King our late Sovereign was *seduced*, and in that he knew *by whom he was compassed*, in that I call the King's Majesty's Book."‡ And after taunting him with having commanded it to be published and read in his diocese, and forbidden his clergy to preach against it, he adds, "And therefore, after your Grace hath four years continually lived in agreement of that doctrine under our late Sovereign Lord, now so suddenly after

* See Collyer's Hist. ii. 168.

† Life of Cranmer, Append. No. 35.

‡ The "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition," was generally called the King's Book, having been revised by him, and published in his name.

his death to write to me that his Highness was *seduced*, it is, I assure you, a very strange speech."

We are obliged to Bishop Gardiner for the information his letter conveys, and shall probably be not much moved by his taunts, well knowing the difficulties with which the good Archbishop had to contend.

With respect to the real character of this book, and Cranmer's disapproval of it, it may be worth while to quote the remarks of the Nonjuror Collyer.

"Under the Sacrament of the Altar, the '*Erudition*' speaks plainly for transubstantiation, which the '*Institution*' doth not. But now, we are to observe, the *Six Articles* were enacted; and farther, that Cranmer and his party, who opposed the passing the *Six Articles*, *were overruled in the composing this Necessary Erudition*.' The '*Erudition*' insists on the sufficiency of receiving under one kind, of which there is not a word in the '*Institution*.' The '*Erudition*' likewise takes notice, that priests used to receive only under one kind, except when they consecrate."—"To add a word or two by way of comparison: The '*Erudition*' manages with less latitude, *bends to the Six Articles*, and in some points of controversy *drives further into the doctrines of the Roman communion* . . . . . In a word, where the '*Erudition*' differs from the '*Institution*,' it seems mostly to lose ground, to go off from the primitive plan, and *reform backwards*. Besides, this last Book does not stand upon so strong an authority as the former. The '*Institution*,' as we have seen, was the act of the whole Clergy, and subscribed by both Houses of Convocation. But the '*Necessary Erudition*,' as our learned historian observes, was drawn up only by a Committee of the King's nomination. 'Tis true, the Preface tells us, 'twas approved by the Lords Spiritual in Parliament; but this may possibly amount to no more than a majority in the Upper House." (Eccles. Hist. ii. 190, 191.)

The statements in this work on "the Sacrament of the Altar" and Justification, may be judged of by the following extracts.

"In this most high Sacrament of the Altar, the creatures which be taken to the use thereof, as bread and wine, do not remain still in their own substance, but by the virtue of Christ's word in the consecration be changed and turned to the very substance of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesu Christ . . . . By these words [referring to Matt. xxvi., &c.], it is plain and evident to all them which with meek, humble, and sincere heart will believe Christ's words, and be obedient

unto faith, that, in the Sacrament, the things that be therein be the very body and blood of Christ in very substance. Which thing whosoever will deny, he denieth the very open and plain words of Christ, which cannot be but true; for he is truth itself and cannot lie."

And it proceeds to defend the reception of the Sacrament by the people under one kind only, observing that,—

"If any man should teach that the lay people. . . be seduced, and so cause them to think that the whole body and blood of Christ were not comprehended in that only form of bread, as well as in both the kinds, this doctrine ought utterly to be refused and abjected, as a pestiferous and a devilish school." (pp. 263, 265, 266.)

On justification, it says,—

"Not only faith, as it is a distinct virtue or gift by itself, is required to our justification, but also the other gifts of the grace of God . . . . And whereas in certain places of Scripture our justification is ascribed to faith . . it is to be understood of faith . . wherein the fear of God, repentance, hope, and charity be included and comprised . . . . Our good works which we do, being once justified, by faith and charity, avail both to the conservation and perfection of the said virtues in us, and also to the increase and end of our justification and everlasting salvation." (p. 368.)

It is hardly necessary to point out, how directly contrary these remarks on Justification are to what we find in Cranmer's Homily on Salvation, published only four years after, in 1547. To this fact we have Gardiner's own testimony, who refused his assent to the "Homily on Salvation," chiefly on account of its maintaining the doctrine that we are justified by faith only, to the exclusion even of charity in the office of justification, contrary to the views upheld in the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition."* And, while adverting to this subject, it may be worth while to point attention to this controversy between Cranmer and Gardiner, as showing the real meaning of the Article and Homily on the subject of Justification, which in modern times has been too often explained away. One of Cranmer's arguments, mentioned by Gardiner, may at once convince us what *his*

* See his Letters to the Lord Protector, in Fox's Acts and Monum. ed. 1838, vol. 6, pp. 45—55. Also a portion of one omitted by Fox, given by Collyer, ii. 230, and Strype, in his Cranmer, App. No. 36.

meaning was in those documents. Gardiner says in one of his letters,—"And one argument my Lord [i. e. Cranmer] hath devised, which he frameth thus: 'We be justified by faith without all works of the law: charity is a work of the law: ergo we are justified without charity.'"* There can be no doubt, then, as to the real meaning of the Article and Homily.

Against this Homily it seems he had also other grounds of complaint, for he says,—

"As for my lord of Canterbury's Homily of Salvation, [it] hath as many faults as I have been weeks in prison, which be seven, besides the general, that the matter maketh a trouble without necessity, and is handled contrary to the teaching of the Parliament."†

What he means by its making a "trouble without necessity," is shown by a previous letter, where he urges (upon his own Popish views) that any such disquisition on the doctrine of Justification is perfectly unnecessary in a Church where all are baptized as infants, "in which Sacrament of Baptism all we be justified before we can talk of this justification we strive for."‡ If Cranmer, then, had agreed with him in this view of baptism, no doubt he would have felt the same as to the uselessness of the controversy on Justification.

There can be no question, therefore, that Cranmer is not responsible for any statements in the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition;" nor, consequently, that those statements are entirely incapable of affording any valid argument as to the meaning of the Formularies of our Reformed Church.§

But I must add still further, that even where they *do* express the views which Cranmer held at the time they were made, they cannot be taken as any evidence of what his views were a few years afterwards. And I make this assertion on his own testimony.

---

* See Fox, as above, p. 49. Collyer ii. 232.

† See Fox, as above, p. 55.

‡ Ib. p. 49.

§ So little, however, is the Bishop of Exeter acquainted with the history of these works, that he unhesitatingly says to his clergy, "Look at the Formularies set forth in this country during the reign of Henry VIII., *in all of which* Cranmer, the compiler of our Articles, *had the principal hand*." (Charge, 3rd ed. p. 10.) And again, after enumerating by name the four Formularies I have just mentioned, his Lordship says,—"Cranmer, I repeat, *had the chief hand in all of these*." (p. 14.)

In his Answer to Gardiner, first published in 1551, he says,—

"Now forasmuch as you say, that 'you will pass over the unreverent handling of Christ's words, which you heard me once more seriously rehearse in solemn open audience,' I acknowledge that *not many years passed* I was yet in darkness concerning this matter [i. e. Christ's presence in the Eucharist], *being brought up in scholastical and Romish doctrine, whereunto I gave too much credit.* And therefore I grant, that you have heard me stand and defend the untruth, which I then took for the truth . . . . But praise be to the everliving God, who hath wiped away those Saulish scales from mine eyes." (Works, P. S. ed. vol. i. p. 241.)

And again, in the same work, in reply to Dr. Smith, he speaks yet more fully as to this change of views, as follows,—

"But this I confess of myself, that not long before I wrote the said Catechism [that of Nuremberg, translated by the Archbishop, or under his direction, and published in 1548] I was in that error of the real presence, as I was many years past *in divers other errors; as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass, of pilgrimages, purgatory, pardons,* AND MANY OTHER SUPERSTITIONS AND ERRORS THAT CAME FROM ROME; being brought up from youth in them, and nousled therein for lack of good instruction from my youth, the outrageous floods of papistical errors at that time overflowing the world. For the which, and other mine offences in youth, I do daily pray unto God for mercy and pardon. . . . But after it had pleased God to show unto me, by his holy word, a more perfect knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ, *from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of him, by little and little I put away my former ignorance.* And as God of his mercy gave me light, so through his grace I opened mine eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugn unto God and remain in darkness . . . . And now I may say of myself, as St. Paul said: 'When I was like a babe or child in the knowledge of Christ, I spake like a child, and understood like a child: but now that I come to man's estate, and growing in Christ, through his grace and mercy, I have put away that childishness.'" (Ib. p. 374.)

Such is Cranmer's own account of the change of view his mind underwent; and be it observed that two at least of the points expressly specified here as among those on which his views had undergone a change, were points maintained in the works I have just been referring to; so that, though he uses the phrase "many years passed," he *includes* the period in which these works were published.

It is difficult to see, then, how any of these semi-Popish works can be taken as affording evidence *of any kind* as to the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. For not only was Cranmer, at the time of their publication, by his own confession, greatly in the dark as to many of the doctrines of the Gospel, but hampered by the King and most of his brother prelates in all he did. And the "Necessary Doctrine" was directly disapproved of by him.

But I will go one step further. As it respects the point now in question, the effect of infant baptism, (with the exception, perhaps, of the last) their testimony, even as it stands, will be of little use to those that maintain that all men are spiritually regenerate who have been baptized in infancy.

It must always be recollected in interpreting such documents, (which are in fact, to a great extent, *protests against error*,) what were the errors more particularly in view; and the language used must be considered as *especially directed against such errors*. The reasonableness of this is obvious, because it often happens that a general statement directed expressly against one particular error, is not so guarded as to be incapable of having an inference drawn from its words in favour of some other error not at the time in the mind of its author. If, for instance, it was asserted, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is merely a meeting together of Christians to eat bread and wine in memory of our Lord's death, we might justly say, in opposition to this view, that this Sacrament is one in which there is a spiritual presence of Christ to the soul, by which it is nourished and strengthened. To meet the error opposed, it would be unnecessary to proceed to define the state of mind necessary in the receiver, in order that this effect should be realized. But the words, as they stand, might be urged as maintaining that the souls of *all* who partake of this Sacrament are thus nourished. And such a mode of arguing has, in fact, been the great source of misconception as to the views of our early divines on the subject of baptism.

Now the great errors which had recently arisen among Protestants at the period of these documents, were these two: (1), the error that the Sacraments are bare signs; (2), the error (of the Anabaptists) that infants, as not having faith, are not proper

subjects for baptism. And the doctrine of the Church of Rome was not then fixed, as it was subsequently at the Council of Trent.

And we must bear in mind further (to enter fully into their views) that our divines held at that time, as appears by these documents, a view which beyond doubt was afterwards, to say the least, *relinquished* as a *public* doctrine of the Church, namely, that none but the baptized, even of infants, are saved.

Against these two errors, then, the statements in these documents are particularly directed. From whatever cause it may have arisen, the question whether *all* infants are or are not partakers of full spiritual regeneration in baptism, is not determined in them.

Thus, in opposition to the first error, it is maintained that the Sacrament of Baptism is a rite in which God bestows pardoning mercy and regenerating grace upon the soul, which is therefore spoken of (in Scriptural terms) as the laver of regeneration, &c. Our Reformers, from first to last, agreed with the majority of the most distinguished Continental Reformers in maintaining that baptism (when spoken of in the abstract with reference to its true nature, intent, and purpose) is a rite divinely appointed as the instrument in the use of which a certain spiritual blessing is conveyed by God to the recipient; and the consequence was, that *both*, when speaking of baptism *in the abstract*, used the strongest expressions as to the value of the blessings conferred in it by God; and they did this, both for the purpose of upholding the truth, and counteracting the opposite error.

But it is, palpably, a misinterpretation of this language, to infer from it, that this Sacrament is represented thereby as having this effect upon *all* who partake of it; because such general statements refer to the case of *adults* as well as *infants*; and, in the former case, it is admitted, even in these documents, that faith and repentance are necessary to a salutary reception of the Sacrament. Therefore some similar qualification may have been held necessary in the latter case.

Against the latter error, it is maintained, that infants ought to be baptized, and that they experience, *as well as adults*, the blessed effects of baptism. But it is no more asserted, that *all* infants experienced those effects, than that all adults experienced them. True, it is pointed out that faith and repentance are the qualifications for a salutary reception of the Sacrament by an

adult; and no distinction is clearly drawn between one case and another in the reception of the Sacrament by infants; but no argument can be derived from this, except that our Reformers were not prepared to tie men up to one view on a point not determined by Scripture, and on which the minds of men were divided; some holding (as Luther) that infants have faith, and are baptized on the presumption of their having faith; others, that the salutary effect of baptism followed in the case of *elect* infants; and others probably varying from both those views.

And further, (holding as they *then* did, that none but the baptized are saved) they remonstrated against the supposition that infants are not the objects of the divine mercy, and therefore contended that they ought to be made partakers of that rite which they considered necessary to their salvation. But to interpret these words as meaning that *all* infants are *alike* the objects of the divine mercy, is a gratuitous and unwarranted assumption, and, I may add, a misinterpretation grounded upon a forgetfulness of the doctrinal views of many of the authors of such statements.

It must be remembered, that however much the notion may have prevailed among us *in modern times*, that all infants of Christian parents are in the sight of God equally entitled by his promise to receive the full baptismal grace, such was far from being the prevailing notion in the times of which we are speaking. I have already noticed the fact, that Luther held that infants are capable of faith, and in his Catechism, published in 1529, expressly says that infants are baptized, *hac spe atque animo, quod certo credant,* that is, in this hope and persuasion, that they certainly believe. And the same view is clearly inculcated in a work published in 1540 by one who, in 1541, was made by Cranmer one of the six preachers at Canterbury Cathedral—Lancelot Ridley—in a passage which I shall now quote. And such faith was of course (according to the doctrinal system embraced, as I have shown above, by this author) considered to be a gift freely bestowed by God according to his own will.

In his Commentary on the Ephesians,* speaking on the subject of baptism, he says (on V. 25—27):

* First published in 1540, and reprinted from the copy in the Cambridge University Library in Richmond's Fathers of the English Church, vol. ii. pp. 13 et seq.

"Here is shewed, how Christ hath purged his Church truly in the fountain of water, by his word. Although God, of his mere mercy and goodness, without all man's deserts or merits, only for Christ's sake, hath washed and purged man from sin; yet he useth a mean, by the which he cleanseth men from sin, which is by baptism in water, by the word of God; and so in baptism are our sins taken away, and we from sins purged, cleansed, and regenerated in a new man, to live an holy life, according to the Spirit and will of God. It is not the water that washes us from our sins, but Christ by his word and his Spirit, given to us in baptism, that washeth away our sins, that we have of Adam by carnal nature." (p. 135.)

And he proceeds to observe (according to the views of the time) that

"Children, of necessity, must be christened, or else they cannot be purged of their sins, nor yet saved by Christ, and come to life everlasting. Wherefore the Anabaptists that would not have children to be christened, they shew themselves that they would not have children to be purged from their sins and be saved. If they would have children saved, they would not deny to them the means whereby Christ purgeth *his Church* from sins, and saveth it, which is by baptism, as here appeareth."

And he repeats in the context the same doctrine; with the saving clause, however, "except God of his absolute power do save them." (p. 136.)

The argument is this,—Christ "purgeth *his Church*" by baptism, and none can be saved who are not thus purged. If therefore we admit that *any* infants belong to his Church, they ought to be baptized; and as we cannot discriminate which do, and which do not, belong to his Church at that age, *all* must be baptized; of course in the hope, as to *each*, that *it* may be of the number of the members of Christ's mystical body. And if it die in infancy, few have ever denied that it is to be considered to have been so.

And when he comes to reply to the objections of the Anabaptists, he meets them in these words:—

"They say, that those that should be christened, must first believe, and then be christened. Children, they say, cannot believe, for 'faith is gotten by hearing and hearing by the word of God.' So children cannot have faith, say these Anabaptists; wherefore they say that children should not be christened. To this reason I answer and say, *that children may have faith*, although they have it not by hearing,

yet *they have faith by infusion of the Holy Ghost*, as the holy prophets had, and many holy men in the old law had. Also, *faith is the gift of God, and the work of the Holy Ghost. Who should let God to give his gifts where he will, seeing faith is the gift of God?* (Eph. ii.; Phil. i.) He may give faith as well to children, as to old men. Faith also is *the work of God* (John vi.), *and not of man, of man's will, or reason. Who shall let God to work, where he list?* Therefore it is not impossible for children to have faith, as these Anabaptists falsely suppose.

"Also God regardeth no persons, but *giveth his gifts, without all regard of persons;* a child or old man be counted as persons in Scripture: wherefore it followeth plainly, that he *giveth not faith to an old man, or* [*? and*] *denieth faith to a child, because he is a child;* for then God should regard persons which he doth not. [It will be observed here, that faith is considered as in all cases a free gift, given as God listeth.]

"And where they say, that they must express their faith before they be christened; what will they do with deaf and dumb men, that get not faith by hearing, nor cannot express their faith by words? Will they exclude them from baptism, and condemn them to hell-pit?

"And also some aged, peradventure, will dissemble, and say, they have faith, when they have not faith; and if they will christen none without they be *certain of their faith*, then shall they *christen none, neither young nor old;* seeing that old may dissemble and sav they have faith, when they have not faith." (pp. 140, 141.)

And he *expressly requires faith in infants that they may be accepted;* for, referring to Matt. xix. 14, 15, and Mark x. 14, et seq.—where Christ took the children in his arms, and blessed them, and said, Of such is the kingdom of God,—in favour of infant baptism, he says,—

"Here are tokens that God loved these children, that they pleased him, and THAT THEY HAD FAITH; FOR WITHOUT FAITH NO MAN CAN PLEASE GOD. Heb. xi." (p. 138.)

From these passages, then, it is evident in what way we are to interpret the general statements previously made by this author as to the benefits and blessings accompanying baptism; statements which, if they had not been accidentally accompanied by this reply to the objections of the Anabaptists, showing the limitation to be placed to their meaning, would, beyond doubt, have

been applied (according to modern reasoning) to show that what was said applied to the case of *every* infant baptized.

Such was the doctrine of an eminent divine at the very period in which these documents were put forth.

Now it is probable, from a passage in Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner,* that he did not hold that infants were capable of actual faith: but (as I shall shew presently) he maintained, even at this time, the doctrine of Peter Martyr and Bucer, (whom he afterwards, in 1547 and 1548, chose as his great helpers in carrying on the work of the English Reformation); who, while they do not seem to have regarded infants as capable of *actual* faith, considered such only to be acceptable recipients of baptism *in the sight of God*, and to be made true members of Christ's mystical body, whom he had *chosen* to be his children.

I now proceed, then, to give the passages on our present subject, from the documents above referred to.

First, from the Articles of 1536.† The article on Baptism, after asserting that baptism is "necessary for the attaining of everlasting life, according to the saying of Christ, John iii. 5," proceeds thus,—

"Then, That it is offered unto all men, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have remission of sins, and the grace and favour of God, *according to the saying of Christ (Matt.* [*Mark*] *xvi.), Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit: that is to say, Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*"

Here, clearly, faith is acknowledged to be indispensable to acceptance by God; and apparently with reference to the case of infants as well as adults, for no distinction is drawn between the two cases, but the text quoted is (so far as appears) applied to both.

"Then, That the promise of grace and everlasting life (which promise is adjoined unto this Sacrament of Baptism), pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents, and children; and that they ought therefore and must needs be baptized: and that by the Sacrament of Baptism they do also obtain remission

* Works, vol. i. pp. 124, 125.

† See "Formularies of Faith," &c., pp. xviii–xx.

of their sins, the grace and favour of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God—"

Here is a general statement, to which none but Anabaptists will object, namely, that the promise of grace pertains not only to adults, but to infants; and that what baptism does for the former, it does also for the latter.

And the Article proceeds thus,—

"Insomuch as infants and children *dying in their infancy* shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not."

Now here, besides the doctrine that baptism is absolutely necessary to salvation* (which, as I shall show presently, has been undeniably relinquished by our Church as a doctrine of authority in her communion), the words do not necessarily imply more than that baptism has a salutary effect in the case of all infants who die during the period of infancy. Now the salvation of such infants, (recollecting, of course, that those spoken of are the infants of professing believers, who alone are fit subjects for baptism) few, probably, will be inclined to deny. And the child of a believing parent, foreknown by God as one that will never commit actual sin, may well be considered as a partaker of all the blessings of baptism. Most, even of our modern divines, would, I think, consider such a child as interested, even without baptism, in the promises of the covenant of grace; but such was not the view maintained in these Formularies, in which baptism is considered necessary to that end.

The next Article declares the reason why it was considered that infants must be christened in order to be saved, as follows,—

"Then, That infants must needs be christened, because they be born in original sin, which sin must needs be remitted; which cannot be done but by the Sacrament of Baptism, whereby they receive the Holy Ghost, which exerciseth his grace and efficacy in them, and cleanseth and purifieth them from sin by his most secret virtue and operation."

Here is a general statement as to what baptism works in the

* It is to me doubtful what the words, "and else not," were intended to apply to; but I am willing to take them in the sense attached to them above.

case of infants, but it is obvious that there is here no determination of the question, whether or not it works these effects in the case of *all* infants. And *a proof* that such statements were not understood at that time as implying that these effects are produced in *all* baptized infants, is to be found in the fact, that these general statements are freely made by those who firmly maintained that they are *not*, as for instance, Calvin, Bucer, and Martyr.

The next Article forbids the *iteration* of baptism; the succeeding one condemns the opinions of the Anabaptists and Pelagians; and the last declares the qualifications for adult baptism, i. e., that persons "having the use of reason"

"Shall, by the virtue of that holy Sacrament, obtain the grace and remission of all their sins, *if they shall come thereunto* perfectly and truly repentant and contrite of all their sins before committed, and also perfectly and constantly confessing and believing all the articles of our faith according as it was mentioned in the First Article: and finally, if they shall also have firm credence and trust in the promise of God adjoined to the said Sacrament, that is to say, that in and by this said Sacrament, which they shall receive, God the Father giveth unto them, for his Son Jesu Christ's sake, remission of all their sins, and the grace of the Holy Ghost, whereby they be newly regenerated, and made the very children of God," &c. (pp. xix, xx.)

Now, whatever interpretation the Romanizing party of that period may have put on the words of these Articles, and they were very probably intended to admit of more than one sense, (just as in other parts Bishop Lloyd observes* that "in many points the name only of the doctrine appears to be retained, while the principle is, in fact, surrendered"), there is certainly nothing in them asserting that *all* infants indiscriminately are regenerated in baptism. The first Article clearly points in a different direction. And the quotation I have just given from L. Ridley proves that some at the time would so have interpreted it, that is, as opposed to such a notion. We have already seen how much the Romanists were divided among themselves on the question of the effects of baptism in infants, previous to the Council of Trent. We need not wonder, therefore, at any indefiniteness of expres-

* Pref. p. iv.

sion occurring in Formularies drawn up by those who had just begun to think for themselves on such matters.

But such general statements are totally insufficient to prove that all men are spiritually regenerate who have been baptized in infancy. What the advocates of such a doctrine want is, some definite declaration that God looks upon *all* infants with equal favour, and that although all adults are *not*, yet that all infants *are*, spiritually regenerated in baptism: and still further, some evidence that what is spoken of infants, even if intended to apply to all universally, does not apply to them *merely as infants*, but extends to their condition as adults. For there had been much difference of opinion on this point.

But the best proof of the interpretation which, at least, Cranmer and his party must have put upon those statements, is to be found in the passages with which *these very same statements* are connected in the "Institution of a Christian Man," published in *the next year*. Here the article on Baptism is precisely the same as that in the "Articles" of 1536.* And yet in another part of the same work we find those remarkable passages, some of which I have already placed before the reader,† and to which I must now again call his attention.

In the paraphrase of the Ninth Article of the Creed (that on the Church) we read,—

"I believe assuredly . . . . that there is and hath been ever from the beginning of the world, and so shall endure and continue for ever, one certain number, society, communion, or company of *the elect and faithful people of God*; of which number our Saviour Jesu Christ is the only head and governor, and the members of the same be all those holy saints which be now in heaven, and also all *the faithful people of God* which be now on life, or that ever heretofore have lived, or shall live here in this world.". . . . "And I believe assuredly that *this congregation*, according as it is called in Scripture, so it is in very deed the city of heavenly Jerusalem . . . *the holy Catholic Church*." —"And I believe that this whole congregation is all holy . . . so purified and mundified, as well by Christ's most precious blood, as also by the godly presence, governance, and assistance of his Holy

* See "Formularies," &c. pp. 92—94. It is so far a *verbatim* transcript, that the differences are only in a few unimportant words not affecting the sense.

† See pp. 40 et seq. above.

Spirit . . . . that neither the lepry of heresy, or false and perverse doctrine . . . . shall be able finally to prevail against them, or to pull any of them out of the hands and possession of Christ." "I believe assuredly . . . . that all such members as be fallen out from the same by sin, *shall at length rise again by penance, and shall be restored and united again unto the same holy body.*"

"And I believe assuredly that in this Holy Church, and with the members of the same (so long as they be militant and living here in earth), there have been ever, and yet be, and ever shall be joined and mingled together, *an infinite number of the evil and wicked people*, which, although they be indeed the very members of the congregation of the wicked, and, as the gospel calleth them, *very weeds and chaff, evil fish and goats*, and shall finally be judged to everlasting damnation; yet, forasmuch as they do live in the common society or company of those which be the very quick and living members of Christ's mystical body, and outwardly do profess, receive, and consent with them for a season in the doctrine of the Gospel, and in the right using of the Sacraments, yea and ofttimes be endued with right excellent gifts of the Holy Ghost, they be to be accounted and reputed here in this world to be in the number of the said very members of Christ's mystical body, so long as they be not by open sentence of excommunication precided and excluded from the same. NOT BECAUSE THEY BE SUCH MEMBERS IN VERY DEED, but because the certain judgment and knowledge of that their state is by God's ordinance *hidden and kept secret* from all men's knowledge, and shall not be revealed until the time that Christ himself shall come at the world's end, and there shall manifest and declare his very kingdom, *and who be the very true members of his body and who be not.*"*

Again, in the "Notes and Observations on the Creed," it is said;—

"In the ninth Article, [on the Church] many things be to be noted. First, that this word *church*, in Scripture, is taken sometime generally for *the whole congregation of them that be christened and profess Christ's Gospel:* and sometime it is taken for *the Catholic congregation, or number of them only which be chosen, called, and ordained to reign with Christ in everlasting life.* . . . It is to be noted that by these parables, and certain such other, rehearsed in Scripture, is signified, that *among them which be christened*, and do profess Christ's gospel, and live in the common society and communion of the Sacraments of the Church, divers be indeed *the very*

* See pp. 42–45 above; and pp. 52–54 of the "Institution."

quick and living members of Christ's mystical body, and shall reign with him everlastingly in honour. And that the congregation or society of them is the very field, and they be the very good corn or seed, which *Christ himself did sow*. And divers be indeed chaff, or stinking and naughty weeds, *sown by the devil*," &c. . . . "By these parables also it is signified, that in this present life these two sorts of people, good and bad, be continually mixed and mingled together in the Church, as it is taken in the first signification. And that the said *members of the synagogue of the devil*, so long as they grow in the same field wherein the good corn groweth, that is to say, so long as they do in outward appearance profess the same faith of Christ which the very members of Christ's church do profess, and do consent and agree with them outwardly in the doctrine of the Gospel, and in all other things appertaining unto Christ's religion; they must be *accepted and reputed here in the world* for the very members of Christ's mystical body; and that they ought not, ne can be dissevered from them, until the day of judgment." "Fourthly, it is to be noted, that of the Church, as it is taken in the second manner of signification, it is said in Scripture that she is the heavenly Jerusalem, the city of God. . . . All which sentences, and divers such other, spoken in Scripture of the Church, be to be referred and verified of the Church in *the second signification*. And finally, *in this signification also the ninth Article of our Creed is to be understanded*," &c., &c.*

Having thus divided the nominal Church into two bodies, the one consisting of those that are "*christened* and profess Christ's Gospel," but are indeed *chaff and weeds* "*sown by the devil*," and the other of "the Catholic congregation," the Church of the Creed, composed of "*those* ONLY which be *chosen, called, and ordained to reign with Christ in everlasting life*," and distinctly maintained that none of those who are made true members of Christ's mystical body, the Catholic Church, *can ever perish or fall away finally*; it also shows how our Lord acts towards those who are "chosen, called, and ordained to reign with him in everlasting life," namely, that in the case of "*the very members* of his Church," he shall "continually rule them, direct them, govern them, sanctify them, and give unto them *remission of their sins*, and all spiritual comfort, as well inwardly by faith, and other his secret operations, as also *outwardly by the open*

* See the passages more fully in pp. 16, 17 above; and pp. 75—80 of the "Institution."

ministration and efficacy of the word of God and of his *holy sacraments.*" (See p. 43 above; or, "Institution," p. 51.)

And hence the Christian is taught to say, as part of his belief:

"I believe and trust assuredly, that I am one of the members of this Catholic Church, and that God of his only mercy hath not only chosen and called me thereunto by his Holy Spirit, and by *the efficacy* of his word and *Sacraments,* and hath inserted and united me into this universal body or flock, and hath made me his son and inheritor of his kingdom; but also that he shall of his like goodness, and by the operation of the Holy Ghost, justify me here in this world, and finally glorify me in heaven." (See p. 45 above; or "Institution," pp. 56, 57.)

And in speaking of the Article on "the Communion of Saints," it remarks that this expression is variously interpreted; and among the various interpretations which it *commends to the attention of the reader,* occurs the following;—

"Some doctors do expound it to signify that treasure of the Church [meaning the true Catholic Church as before defined] which is common equally unto all the members of the same. And those doctors which be of this opinion do interpretate that treasure to be nothing else but the grace, that is to say, the mercy, the goodness, and the favour of God in this world, and glory in the world to come. They say also, that this grace of God is the common treasure of all *the elect people of God,* and that our poverty is so extreme, that of ourselves, without this grace, we should be utterly nothing. They say further, that the effect and virtue of this grace is to make us able to rise from sin and flee from sin, to work good works, to receive the reward of everlasting glory, to have and retain the true sense and understanding of Holy Scripture, and to endue us with Christian faith, hope, and charity. Finally, they say, that this grace worketh all those effects *in the elect people of God, by two special instruments, which be, the word of God and his Sacraments.* And forasmuch as both the word *and the Sacraments have all their efficacy* by and through the might and operation of the Holy Ghost, and forasmuch also as this Holy Ghost *dwelleth and abideth only in the Catholic Church, and in the members of the same, and worketh none of these effects out of the Church;* they think that by this clause, *communion of saints,* is meant here the treasure of the Church; and that this treasure is nothing else but the Holy Ghost himself, and his graces," &c. (See p. 48 above; or, "Institution," pp. 79, 80.)

Here, then, in this very document of 1537, we find an end of the whole controversy, for it cannot be pretended that Cranmer was

less Protestant when he subsequently drew up our Formularies, *the contrary* being notoriously the case. It is here distinctly laid down, that none but those who are elected and ordained to eternal life, and are such as will never fall away, *ever* belong to the true Catholic Church, or are members of Christ's mystical body, all others never being members at all. Consequently there is an end to the notion that all are made so in their baptism. The very essence of spiritual regeneration is incorporation into the true mystical body of Christ, the Catholic Church of the Creed. But none (according to this document) are *ever* so incorporated, but those who will ultimately be saved, and therefore none but such receive true spiritual regeneration. There is no spiritual new birth in "chaff and weeds" "sown by the devil." And the "*efficacy*" of the Sacraments is here distinctly limited to the "*very* members of Christ's body."

Have some of those who are so fond of quoting certain passages from this work on one point ever read it? I doubt whether we shall hear so much of it from that quarter hereafter.

And I cannot refrain from anticipating here (in passing) a remark which I shall have to dwell further upon hereafter, namely, that to argue from the words of the Catechism, (drawn up by Cranmer, or under his direction)—"baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, &c.,"—that therefore *every* child baptized is certainly made in baptism, in the full spiritual sense, a member of Christ, &c., because it is taught to use such words respecting itself, merely betrays the ignorance of the arguer as to the doctrinal views of those who drew up this form, as illustrated by works of the same period. The expressions are identical with those of the paraphrase of the Creed in the "Institution," where the context shows, that they are considered as applying only, in their strict interpretation, to the case of the true child of God, "elect and ordained to eternal life." And the child, evidently, was instructed to use them in order to teach him the language then held to be the befitting language of every true Christian; who was exhorted to feel assured of, and put his trust in, God's purposes of special and gratuitous mercy towards him.

It may be worth while to add, that in the article on Confirmation in this work (pp. 94, 95), the benefit of the Sacrament of Baptism is limited to those who "*duly receive*" it.

The next document, in the order of time, that has been ap-

pealed to, is what the Bishop of Exeter, after Dr. Jenkyns, calls the "Articles agreed upon by Cranmer with the German Reformers in 1538." This title, however, is a mere guess; and I am disposed to think with Strype,* that they were rather Articles drawn up in conformity with the Act passed in 1540, appointing a Commission to prepare Articles of Faith for the English Church. On this point, however, I shall not enlarge, nor upon the fact that they appear to be merely a rough draught of what was never finally settled, for whatever purpose they were intended. And it is very probable that (as the Bishop of Exeter asserts) Cranmer had the principal hand in them.

But the Article that occurs in them on the subject of Baptism is a mere counterpart of the statements in the Articles of 1536, and the "Institution." And in the Article "On Original Sin," we find a passage entirely contrary to the notion that regeneration is always conferred in baptism. "All men," it says, "have concupiscence, repugnant to the law of God; and this original disease or corruption is truly sin, damning and bringing now also eternal death on those who are not born again by baptism *and the Holy Spirit*."†

The Article on Baptism runs thus,—

"De Baptismo dicimus, quod baptismus a Christo sit institutus, et sit necessarius ad salutem, et quod per baptismum offerantur remissio peccatorum et gratia Christi infantibus et adultis. Et quod non debeat iterari baptismus, et quod infantes debeant baptizari. Et quod infantes per baptismum consequantur remissionem peccatorum et gratiam, et sint filii Dei, quia promissio gratiæ et vitæ æternæ pertinet non solum ad adultos, sed etiam ad infantes. Et hæc promissio per ministerium in ecclesia infantibus et adultis administrari debet. Quia vero infantes nascuntur cum peccato originis, habent opus remissione illius peccati, et illud ita remittitur ut reatus tollatur, licet corruptio naturæ seu concupiscentia manet in hac vita, etsi incipit sanari, quia Spiritus Sanctus in ipsis etiam infantibus est efficax et eos mundat. Probamus igitur sententiam Ecclesiæ, quæ damnavit Pelagianos, quia negabant infantibus esse peccatum originis. Damnamus et Anabap-

* Eccles. Memor. I. 356, 357; or I. i. 550, 551, and Append. No. cxii.

† Omnes homines....habent concupiscentiam, repugnantem legi Dei: estque hic morbus seu vitium originis vere peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque æternam mortem his qui non renascuntur per baptismum *et Spiritum Sanctum*. Cranmer's Works, P. S. ed. vol. 2. App. p. 372.

tistas, qui negant infantes baptizandos esse. De adultis vero docemus, quod ita consequuntur per baptismum remissionem peccatorum et gratiam, si baptizandi attulerint pœnitentiam veram, confessionem articulorum fidei, et credant vere ipsis ibi donari remissionem peccatorum et justificationem propter Christum, sicut Petrus ait in Actis, 'Pœnitentiam agite, et baptizetur, &c.' "* .

Now here it will be observed, that (besides the doctrine of the necessity of baptism, *then held*), nothing more is stated than that infants are proper subjects for baptism as well as adults; and that they obtain the same spiritual blessing in baptism as adults do; which all but Anabaptists allow; and further, that adults obtain the blessings of baptism only if they come with penitence and faith, &c.; the doctrine on the subject of the acceptance of infants by God being left (as it is in Scripture) to be inferred from that in the case of adults.

It is clear that in none of the documents we have been considering is there any assertion that *all* infants indiscriminately are partakers in baptism of its full spiritual blessing. The doctrine of the "Institution" is opposed to it. And I have shown that one at least of the principal divines of the period, of Cranmer's party (L. Ridley), held that faith was a necessary condition of their acceptance in baptism.

I proceed to the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man."

Here, as might be expected from the account already given of this work, we find the language in which the doctrine of Baptism is delivered, like the rest, changed. *The valuable explication of the Creed, given in the "Institution," is* ENTIRELY REMOVED, *and in its place an interpretation of a totally different theological character substituted.* And as the articles on "the Sacrament of the Altar," the Second Commandment (on the question of Images), and Justification, are all altered (the last especially), so as to make them more favourable to the Popish doctrine; so the article on the Sacrament of Baptism is of course another specimen of similar alterations.

Thus, the language used is, that by baptism infants "being offered in the faith of the Church receive forgiveness of their sin,

* Ib. p. 475.

and such grace of the Holy Ghost, that if they die in the state of their infancy, they shall thereby undoubtedly be saved." (Art. on Baptism, p. 254.) And again, "As for infants, it is to be believed that their justification is wrought by the secret operation of the Holy Ghost in their baptism, they being offered in the faith of the Church." (Art. on Justification, p. 366.) And the same declaration is of course made as to the necessity of baptism to infants for their salvation, in these words,—"Seeing that out of the Church neither infants nor no man else can be saved, they must needs be christened and cleansed by baptism, and so incorporated into the Church." (Art. on Baptism, p. 255.)*

The language is here changed from what was used before. It is not merely said that infants receive grace in baptism as well as adults, which all but Anabaptists admit, and that those who die in infancy are thereby saved (according to the doctrine of the period), but the words used definitely imply that *all* receive forgiveness, the grace of the Holy Ghost, and justification, *of whom* such as die in infancy are thereby saved.

Nevertheless, even this work itself, speaking of the "new life of grace and the Spirit," in which we have "bound ourselves by baptism" to "walk and proceed," says,—

"Into the which we are called by the word of God, and BY FAITH AND DUE RECEIVING OF THIS HOLY SACRAMENT ARE BROUGHT AND SET INTO THE SAME." (p. 257.)

These contradictory statements are to be accounted for, I suppose, from the difference of view existing in those that were engaged in drawing up this work.

It must be observed, also, that in the "Necessary Doctrine," as well as in all the preceding Formularies, in the case of adults coming to baptism, *faith and repentance* are absolutely required in order to their obtaining the baptismal blessing.† No such

* After the words "thereby undoubtedly be saved," in the quotation given above from p. 254, there followed in the corresponding passage in the "Institution," the words "and else not," which are here omitted. This omission might, in itself, have led to the supposition of a withdrawal of the doctrine of the absolute necessity of baptism to infants for salvation; but this passage in p. 255 negatives such a supposition. Nor would the history of this work lead us to expect such a withdrawal.

† See Art. on the Sacrament of Baptism, pp. 253, 254, 256, and Art. on Justification, p. 365. The passages in the preceding Formularies have been already quoted.

notion is countenanced, even in these semi-Popish works, as the possibility of the reception of any spiritual gift in baptism by adults who come to that rite destitute of these dispositions.

It would hardly be necessary to point attention to this fact in our own Church, where the 25th Article has so definitely settled the doctrine of our Church in the matter, were it not for the lengths to which the Romanising faction that has lately sprung up among us, have proceeded in this among other points; one of its principal organs having the effrontery to maintain, that "not only in the language of charity, but of *fact*, of even an impenitent adult coming to baptism, it may with truth be said, *as the Church of England says*, that he is 'born again,' and 'grafted into the body of Christ's Church,' that he is 'regenerate.'" And to palliate the offensiveness of such a statement, it is added, that "such regeneration and salvation are given only conceptionally," and "the presence of sin closes instantly round the baptismal seed, and renders it unfruitful, and prevents his sins being actually forgiven."* So that the man is maintained to be truly born again and regenerate, &c., though his sins are not forgiven him; and the almost blasphemous assertion is made, that even a wicked hypocrite coming to baptism is *necessarily* a recipient of Divine grace!

---

* Christian Remembrancer for October, 1848, pp. 491, 492. On the reference made in support of this notion to "the theology of the schools," much might be said if it were worth while to do so, as the reader may judge from chapter 2. above. But it is sufficient here to remark, that to send us to the Schoolmen for an interpretation of the Formularies of our Church, shows only the deplorable ignorance of the writer as to the views of our Reformers. The gross and palpable misrepresentations upon which the article is founded render any formal reply to it wholly unnecessary; but one passage so thoroughly shows the complete disregard to truth, and also the ignorance or worse than ignorance of the writer of the article, that it may be well to notice it. Speaking of the theology of the Schools, the writer adds, "A department of divinity, in which Mr. Goode is as ill-read as some of his opponents are *content and desirous to remain in Mr. Goode's foreign Protestants.*" Now the writer of this has not the slightest knowledge on which to ground this assertion, and therefore made it merely to damage an adversary, careless whether it was true or not, and the imputation *implied* happens to be contrary to the truth. But the reason why I notice the passage is, to show how completely the writer is convicted out of his own mouth, (when he thus speaks of the foreign Protestants,) of being totally opposed in doctrine to our Reformers and early divines, who openly avowed their agreement in doctrine with the foreign Reformed Churches. The weapons of Romanizers are always the same.

The object of all this is, to get rid of an argument which admits of no reasonable reply; namely, that as these terms are used in the Service for Adult Baptism hypothetically, (as the Bishop of Exeter himself admits in his recent Charge,) so they may fairly be interpreted in a similar way in the Service for Infant Baptism. The author of the above passages thinks to take a short road to an answer, by denying that even in the Service for Adult Baptism they are used hypothetically.

But these parties are in fact upon the horns of a dilemma. If they take this ground, they are refuted by the 25th Article. If they admit that the terms are used hypothetically in one Service, (as the Bishop of Exeter is compelled to do), it follows that they may fairly be so interpreted in the other.

It is worth notice, also, that even by the authors of the "Necessary Doctrine," "the children of Christian men"* only are contemplated as fit subjects for baptism.

Before I conclude this Chapter, it may be well to show, that our Church, though she has not given any sentence upon the state of unbaptized infants, has at least relinquished the affirmation, that baptism is necessary to the salvation of infants. In all the Formularies we have been considering, this affirmation is unhesitatingly made; and the idea seems to be sanctioned in the first Liturgy of 1549, in which, in the first prayer in the Baptismal Service, occur the following words,—"that they, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, *and so saved from perishing.*" In the revision of the Liturgy, published in 1552, the words "and so saved from perishing" were omitted; a significant intimation of a change of view.

We have also decisive evidence, that at the period of the revision, Cranmer at least did not hold the doctrine of the necessity of baptism for the salvation of infants. For in the "Reformatio Legum," compiled under his superintendence and corrected by him, the notion is very decisively condemned as superstitious and impious, in the following words.

"We ought also to consider as impious the scrupulous superstition of those who so entirely confine the grace of God and the Holy Spirit

* Art. on Baptism, p. 254.

to the elements of the Sacraments as openly to affirm that no infant of Christians will obtain eternal salvation who shall have died before he could be brought to baptism; which we consider to be far otherwise. For salvation is taken away from those only, who despise this sacred font of baptism, or through pride or contumaciousness revolt from it: and since this unreasonableness does not fall in with the age of children, nothing can be determined against their salvation by the authority of the Scriptures; nay, on the contrary, since the general promise comprehends such children within it, we ought to entertain the highest hope of their salvation."*

This shows that the alteration in the Baptismal Service was intentional; and, considering the supremacy of Cranmer's authority at that time in ecclesiastical matters, may be taken as decisive evidence, that the doctrine previously maintained was then relinquished as a doctrine of the Church, though no dogmatic statement was published on the subject.

---

* *Illorum etiam impia videri debet scrupulosa superstitio*, qui Dei gratiam et Spiritum Sanctum tantopere cum Sacramentorum elementis colligant, ut planè affirment, nullum Christianorum infantem æternam salutem esse consequuturum, qui prius a morte fuerit occupatus, quàm ad Baptismum adduci potuerit: *quod longè secus habere judicamus*. Salus enim illis solùm adimitur, qui sacrum hunc Baptismi fontem contemnunt, aut superbia quadam ab eo, vel contumacia resiliunt: quæ importunitas cùm in puerorum ætatem non cadat, nihil contra salutem illorum authoritate Scripturarum decerni potest; immo contra, cùm *illos communis promissio pueros in se comprehendat*, optima nobis spes de illorum salute concipienda est. (Reform. Leg. Eccles.; De hæres. c. 18, p. 17. Ed. 1640.)

CHAPTER VII.

THE DOCTRINE OF OUR LEADING REFORMERS AND DIVINES DURING THE REIGNS OF EDWARD VI. AND ELIZABETH, AND THE EARLIER PART OF THAT OF JAMES I., ON THE SUBJECT OF THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM IN INFANTS.

I NOW proceed to a review of some of the *direct* testimonies which the works of our early divines afford us as to their doctrine on the subject of baptism; and much is it to be regretted that their remains are not more abundant, as in that case we should be able, (as is evident from the general character of their theology), considerably to multiply the amount of evidence given below for the view maintained in this work. But the weight of the testimonies which can be produced, so far as respects the question of number, must be judged by the number and character of the works that remain to us of the period inquired into. And the only important question left is, what evidence (if any) of a *contrary* kind can be produced *from the period of the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth.* It is very immaterial what any of our divines may have maintained on the subject *after* that period. It is a matter of history, that while the theology of our Church, as far as regards its standards of doctrine, remained the same, the views prevalent among the great body of its divines became then very different from what they had previously been. Now whether this change was for the better or the worse, or how far it was within the limits of the words of our Formularies, are questions which I shall not here stop to discuss. What we are now endeavouring to ascertain is, what was the meaning originally attached to our Formularies, by those who put them forth, or first adopted

them. We appeal, in fact, from the interpretation affixed to them by the Laudian party in our Church, to that which was given to them by those who *preceded that party;* and who have, clearly, on various grounds, especially as the compilers or authors or original promoters of those Formularies, or as the immediate successors of such persons, a prior claim upon our regard.

And the first extracts to which I shall call the attention of the reader, are from a document which originally had the highest ecclesiastical and civil sanction, having been issued by Royal authority in the reign of Edward VI., upon the advice of Archbishop Cranmer and the approval of Bishop Ridley, and the heads of the Reformed party in our Church,* namely,

THE CATECHISM OF 1553.

First, let us observe its language respecting the Sacrament of Baptism.

"*Master.* Tell me what thou callest Sacraments.

"*Scholar.* They are certain customable reverent doings and ceremonies ordained by Christ; that by them he might put us in remembrance of his benefits, and we might declare our profession, that we be of the number of them which are partakers of the same benefits, and which fasten all their affiance in him; that we are not ashamed of the name of Christ, or to be termed Christ's scholars.

"*Master.* Tell me (my son) how these two Sacraments be ministered: Baptism, and that which Paul calleth the Supper of the Lord.

"*Scholar.* Him that believeth in Christ, professeth the Articles of the Christian religion, and mindeth to be baptized, (I speak now of them that be grown to ripe years of discretion, sith for the young babes their parents', or the Church's profession sufficeth), the minister dippeth in, or washeth with pure and clean water only, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: and then commendeth him by prayer to God, into whose Church he is now openly as it were enrolled, that it may please God to grant him

* See Cranmer's Works, P. Soc. ed. vol. i. p. 422, and vol. ii. p. 220; and Ridley's Works, P. Soc. ed., pp. 226, 227. This Catechism was probably written by Bishop Ponet. See Letter of Sir J. Cheke to Bullinger in "Orig. Lett. rel. to Engl. Reform.," published by the Parker Society, p. 142.

his grace, whereby he may answer in belief and life agreeably to his profession."

The next question and answer relate to the Lord's Supper.

"*Master.* What doth baptism *represent and set before our eyes?*

"*Scholar.* That we are by the Spirit of Christ new born, and cleansed from sin: that we be members and parts of his Church, received into the communion of saints. For water *signifieth the Spirit.* Baptism is also a *figure* of our burial in Christ, and that we shall be raised up again with him in a new life, as I have before declared in Christ's resurrection."*

This is the whole account given of Baptism in the Catechism. The doctrine implied might safely be left to the judgment of the reader. But other portions of the Catechism place it beyond doubt.

Thus, in the following passage, faith is clearly made essential to the regeneration of, at least, adults.

"*Master.* Why dost thou call God Father?

"*Scholar.* For two causes: the one, for that he made us all at the beginning, and gave life unto us all: the other is more weighty; for that by his Holy Spirit, *and by faith,* he hath *begotten us again* making us *his children:* giving us his kingdom and the inheritance of life everlasting, &c."†

Moreover, the work which Baptism is here said to "represent," is performed only in "the chosen of God," as the following passage shows us.

"*Master.* Why is he [the Holy Spirit] called holy?

"*Scholar.* Not only for his own holiness, but for that by him are made holy *the chosen of God and members of Christ.* And therefore have the Scriptures termed him the Spirit of sanctification or making holy.

"*Master.* Wherein *consisteth this sanctification?*

"*Scholar.* First, we be *new gotten by his inward motion.* And therefore, said Christ, we must be new born of water and of the Spirit."‡

And the true Church of Christ, the Church of the Creed, is considered as consisting of those only who are thus sanctified,

* Liturgies, &c., of Edw. VI., P. Soc. ed., pp. 516, 517.
† Ib. p. 501. ‡ Ib. p. 514.

so that no other of the baptized are supposed to be true members of Christ, the true Church consisting of the scattered but spiritually united body of the truly faithful.

"To the furnishing of this commonwealth [the Church]," it says, "belong all they *as many as do truly fear, honour, and call upon God*, wholly applying their mind to holy and godly living; and all those that putting all their hope and trust in him, do assuredly look for the bliss of everlasting life."*

"The Church, which is an assembly of men called to everlasting salvation, is both gathered together and *governed by the Holy Ghost*, of whom we even now made mention. Which thing, sith it cannot be perceived by bodily sense or light of nature, is by right and for good reason here reckoned among things that are known by belief. And, therefore, this calling together of *the faithful* is called universal because it is bound to no one special place. For God, throughout all coasts of the world, hath them that worship him: which, though they be far scattered asunder by divers distance of countries and dominions, yet are they members most nearly joined of that same body, whereof Christ is the head: and have one Spirit, faith, sacraments, prayers, forgiveness of sins, and heavenly bliss, common among them all;" &c.†

I proceed to

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER;

Archbishop of Canterbury from 1553 *till deprived by Mary. Martyred in* 1555.

Here I must first recall to the recollection of the reader the passages quoted in the last Chapter from the "Institution of a Christian Man,"‡ published in 1537, in the drawing up of which work Cranmer had the principal hand, and which (though containing much Papistical doctrine which Cranmer afterwards wholly abandoned) contains also some very remarkable passages bearing upon the subject of this work. Respecting this treatise, however, I refer the reader (to prevent repetition) to what I have already said in a previous page.

Another work connected with Cranmer's name, from which

* Ib. p. 511. See also p. 72 above.
† Ib. pp. 514, 515.
‡ See pp. 197 et s. above.

passages are often quoted by those who uphold the doctrine of the universal spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism, is a Catechism put forth by him in 1548, and translated from one published originally in German, and translated by Justus Jonas into Latin, which Latin translation appeared in 1539. It has been recently reprinted at Oxford,* with a preface by the late learned Professor Burton, giving an account of its history, which renders it unnecessary for me to dilate upon that point. The Justus Jonas who translated it into Latin is considered by Professor Burton to have been Justus Jonas *senior*, the intimate friend and companion of Luther; *not* (as Strype *conjectures*) Justus Jonas *junior*, who came over to this country, and was for a time with Archbishop Cranmer at Lambeth. I would observe, therefore, that the translator of it into Latin was one of Luther's assistants at the Conference between Luther and Bucer at Wittenberg in 1536, of which an account has already been given;† the name of Justus Jonas standing next to that of Luther in the subscriptions to that Conference.‡ The Catechism was originally published in German, by George, Marquis of Brandenburg, for the use of his own territories and of Nuremberg. Professor Burton remarks, that "of this German original no copy has yet been discovered; but there are good reasons for thinking, that it was one of the numerous Catechisms which appeared in Germany about this period, and which were framed upon the model of Luther's Shorter Catechism."§ Dr. Todd of Trinity College, Dublin, however, has since been fortunate enough to obtain a copy, which he has deposited in the Library of his College. It was printed at Nuremberg in small folio in 1536. That the Marquis of Brandenburg followed the doctrine of Luther in such matters is evident from the "Kirchen Ordnung," or Ecclesiastical Regulations he published for the use of his dominions in 1533, in which the Baptismal Service published by Luther a few years before, occurs *verbatim*.‖

---

* Oxf. 1829. 8vo.

† See pp. 162 et seq. above.

‡ See Buceri Scripta Anglicana, pp. 667, 668.

§ Pref. p. viii.

‖ Professor Burton remarks, that this book, "from the account given of it by Seckendorf, (Hist. Luth. vol. 2. pp. 71, 72), might be thought to have contained the very Catechism which is now under consideration." (Pref. p. viii.) This, however, is not the case. A copy of the book is lying before me as I write, and it certainly does not contain the Catechism.

Now, Luther's doctrine at this period, as delivered in his Larger Catechism, I have already pointed out.* We may be prepared therefore to find, that the doctrine of this Brandenburg Catechism, (by whomsoever drawn up, for its author is not known) translated into Latin by Luther's friend and fellow-labourer Justus Jonas, (his assistant at the Wittenberg Conference in 1536,) corresponds with that of Luther himself at that period. And such we shall find to be the case.†

Now true it is, that this Catechism says, that "the second birth is by the water of baptism;" (p. 182, Oxf. ed.) and that by it "we be born again to a new and heavenly life, and be received into God's Church and congregation, which is the foundation and pillar of the truth," (p. 183); and that it has other similar passages. But with these statements, which are perfectly general, must be compared such declarations as the following occurring in the context.

"These new affections and spiritual motions are in the souls of *such as* ARE *born again by baptism*, but they be *unknown to worldly men*, and such as be not led by the Spirit of God." (p. 189.)

Here, evidently, a distinction is drawn between the baptized; of whom some are considered to be born again, and others not so, but as remaining "worldly men" to whom the "affections and spiritual motions" which characterize the regenerate are "unknown."

And in various passages, (according to the well known doctrine of Luther), faith is spoken of as essential to the salutary effect of baptism.

"All these things doth baptism work in us, when we believe in Christ. And therefore Christ saith, "He that will believe and be baptized, shall be saved. But he that will not believe, shall be damned." (p. 189.)

"Peradventure some will say, How can water work so great things? To whom I answer, that it is not the water that doth these things, but the Almighty word of God (which is knit and joined to

* See p. 158, 159, above.

† Were it necessary, a question might justly be raised how far Cranmer is responsible for the statements of this Catechism, as there are certainly some passages in it contrary to his own views, even at the period of its publication; as, for instance, that there are three sacraments. (p. 183. Oxf. ed.) But it seems hardly worth while to raise this question.

the water) AND FAITH *which receiveth God's word and promise.*" (p. 190.)

"When you shall be asked, What availeth baptism? you shall answer, Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin, it delivereth from the kingdom of the devil and from death, and giveth life and everlasting salvation, *to all them that believe* these words of Christ and promise of God." . . . . . "If a man ask you, How can water bring to pass so great things? ye shall answer, Verily the water worketh not these things, but the word of God, which is joined to the water, and *faith, which doth believe the word of God.*" (p. 191.)

"First of all, the Holy Ghost provoketh and stirreth up men to preach God's word. Then he moveth men's hearts to faith, and calleth them to baptism, and then BY FAITH AND BAPTISM *he worketh so, that he maketh us new men again.* And when we be thus newly born and made again, and be become the children of God, then the Holy Ghost doth dwell in us and make us holy and godly, &c." (p. 122.)

Consequently, notwithstanding the general statements as to the benefits of baptism, faith is made essential to the gift of regeneration. And even if we held that adults only are capable of faith, still the limitation shows that the general statements are not to be understood as excluding all consideration of qualification in the party baptized, and therefore not as excluding it in the case of infants, whatever their particular qualification may be. But the fact is, as we have seen, that the doctrine of Luther (which this Catechism is considered as following) was, that infants are capable of faith, and that faith is requisite in *them* as well as in adults, in order that they may receive a salutary effect from baptism.

The meaning, therefore, of the passages stating the value and efficacy of baptism, is plain. They speak of the ordinance as Bucer himself does, and as he maintains that Scripture speaks of it, namely, as it is when its full end and purpose are fulfilled in it, which, the context states, happens only in the case of fit recipients.

And in another part of the same Catechism the true Church is (according to the general doctrine of the Reformers) limited to those who have true faith and will be saved; so that none become by baptism members of this Church but those that are saved; which again shows that baptism was not considered as always producing this effect. Thus it speaks,—

"I believe the Holy Catholic Church, that is to say, all godly and Christian men must believe, that the Gospel or doctrine of God's grace through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, is never in vain published in the world, or sowed abroad without fruit, but ever there is found some company of men, or some congregation of good people which *believe the Gospel and be saved*. And this company of men which *believeth the Gospel*, although here upon earth they be severed in sundry places, yet are they called one Holy Catholic or Universal Church of Christ, that is to say, a multitude, congregation, or company of Christian people. For this word, Church, doth not here betoken a temple or church builded of timber and stone, but it signifieth *a company of men lightened with the Spirit of Christ*, which do receive the Gospel, and come together to hear God's word, and to pray. And this Christian Church is a communion of saints, that is to say, *all that be of this communion or company be holy*, and be one holy body under Christ their head; they be one holy congregation or assembly. And this congregation receiveth of their Head and Lord Jesus Christ, all spiritual riches and gifts that pertain to the sanctification and making holy of the same body. And these ghostly treasures be common to the whole body, and to every member of the same. For he that is unfeignedly a faithful and godly man, is made partaker of these benefits. And these are the said gifts, which be common to the whole Church of Christ, and to every member of the same."*

From this Catechism let us proceed to Cranmer's own works. Of course it will be easy to find in them statements which, speaking of baptism *in the abstract*, connect regeneration with it.† But, in the context, or elsewhere, he strictly limits the salutary effect of the Sacrament to those who receive it *worthily* or *with faith*. The following passage will abundantly show us the meaning of his phraseology on this subject.—

"This word 'Sacrament,'" he says, "I do sometimes use. . . . for the Sacramental bread, water, or wine. . . . And sometime by this word 'Sacrament,' I mean the whole ministration and receiving of the Sacraments, either of baptism or of the Lord's Supper: and so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the Sacraments; not meaning by that manner of speech, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine, (which be only the outward visible Sacraments,) but that in the due ministration of the Sacraments according to Christ's

* Ib. pp. 123, 124.

† Works, P. S. ed. vol. i. p. 45, &c.

ordinance and institution, Christ and his Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace, *in all them that worthily receive the same.*"*

And thus he continually speaks; as, for instance, in the following passages:—

"Although Christ in his human nature, substantially, really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly, be present with his Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually he is here present. For in water, bread, and wine, he is present, as in signs and sacraments; but he is indeed spiritually in those *faithful Christian people*, which *according to Christ's ordinance* be baptized, or receive the holy communion, *or unfeignedly believe in him.*"†

"Therefore, as in baptism those that come feignedly, and those that come unfeignedly, both be washed with the Sacramental water, but both be *not washed with the Holy Ghost, and clothed with Christ:* so in the Lord's Supper, both eat and drink the Sacramental bread and wine, but both eat not Christ himself, and be fed with his flesh and blood, but those only which *worthily receive* the Sacrament."‡

"Whosoever cometh to that water [*i. e.* of baptism], being of the age of discretion, must examine himself duly, lest if he come unworthily, none otherwise than he would come unto other common waters, he be not renewed in Christ, but *instead of salvation receive his damnation.*"§

And the following passages clearly make baptism and regeneration separable:—

"For as baptism is no perfect Sacrament of spiritual regeneration, without there be as well the element of water, *as the Holy Ghost spiritually regenerating the person that is baptized*, which is signified by the said water; even so the Supper of the Lord can be no perfect Sacrament of spiritual food, except there be as well bread and wine as the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, spiritually feeding us, [which he held to be the case only with the faithful recipient,] which by the said bread and wine is signified."‖

"All that be washed in the water, be not washed with the Holy Spirit."¶

---

* Answer to Gardiner, Preface. See Works, P. S. ed. i. 3.
† Answer to Gardiner, Works, i. 47.
‡ Ib. i. 221.
§ Ib. Answer to Smith, i. 373.
‖ Answer to Gard. ib. i. 304.
¶ Ib. 206.

And, comparing the Sacraments of the Old and New Testaments, he says,—"Our Sacraments contain presently the very things signified, *no more than theirs did.*"*

Moreover all that are spiritually regenerated are undeniably made members of the true Church of Christ; but according to Cranmer, that church consists only of the elect, and all its members persevere to the end. For he says (precisely like the "Institution,")

"And yet I know this to be true, that Christ is present with his holy Church, *which is his holy elected people,* and shall be with them to the world's end, leading and governing them with his holy Spirit, and teaching them all truth necessary for their salvation. And wheresoever any such be gathered together in his name, there is he among them, and he shall not suffer the gates of hell to prevail against them. For although he may suffer them by their own frailness for a time to err, fall, and to die, yet *finally neither Satan, hell, sin, nor eternal death, shall prevail against them.*"†

Now, although the case of infants is not expressly referred to by Cranmer, yet it is obvious, that these limitations show, that the general statements made by him respecting the blessings connected with baptism, are to be understood as referring to it, when fulfilling the purpose for which it was instituted by God in the case of the true members of his Church. The fitness or worthiness of the recipient is supposed in such statements. It is clear, therefore, that the case of infants is, in its measure, affected by such limitations as much as that of adults. We have no right to say, These general statements must, we admit, be understood with an implied condition in the case of *adults,* but they are to be understood as applying universally to *all infants.* For this involves an *assumption* as to the universal worthiness of infants, which, however general among Romish divines, is entirely opposed to the views of the Reformers and early Protestant divines, both in this country and on the Continent. I quite admit that some of our later divines have advocated the doctrine laid down by the scholastic writers of the fifteenth century, that the Sacraments confer grace upon all that do not oppose the obstacle of mortal sin, (*non ponentibus obicem mortalis peccati*) and

* Ib. 75. † Answer to Smith, ib. i. 376.

therefore upon all infants without exception. But I challenge any one to show that this was the doctrine of our Reformers and early Protestant divines; and I will give them to the end of the sixteenth century for authorities on the subject. That the view was maintained here, by some among us, at the period when the prevailing tone of theology in our Church began to change in the time of Laud, I am not anxious to deny. And that the Laudian Bishops who managed matters at the Savoy Conference at the Restoration, and inflicted by their harsh and uncharitable conduct an irreparable blow upon the Church, from which it has never recovered, and never will recover, openly advocated the doctrine, is no doubt perfectly true. But it is equally true, that such a notion is diametrically opposed to the doctrine of our Reformers and early divines. And (though I am anticipating) I will at once show the reader, before I proceed, that I am not speaking without authority when I say this, and will quote the words in which one of our greatest divines has spoken on this subject. Dr. Robert Abbot was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1612 to 1615, and Bishop of Salisbury from 1615 to 1617. He is said even by Wood (no friend to theologians of his school), to have been "a profound divine, most admirably well read in the Fathers, Councils, and Schoolmen;"* and is called by Fuller, "one of the honours not only of that See [Salisbury], but of the Church of England."† In his reply to Thomson, he uses the following language :—

"That *Papistical* saying of the Scholastics, which is the foundation of the *opus operatum*, which nevertheless is here, with inconceivable audacity, put forth as a doctrine of the Catholic faith, that the Sacraments always confer their effect upon one who does not place a bar in the way."‡

And our learned Bishop Carleton, (one of the representatives of our Church at the Synod of Dort)§ after refuting the same doctrine, adds,—

* Ath. Oxon. ii. 224. † Hist. bk. x. p. 72.

‡ "Papisticum illud Scholasticorum pronunciatum, quod operis operati fundamentum est, quod hic tamen *nescio qua fronte* tanquam Catholicæ fidei dogma proponitur, 'Sacramenta semper conferre suum effectum non ponenti obicem.'" In Thomson. Diatribam, c. 7. p. 119. Sub fin. tract. De gratia et persev. sanct. Lond. 1618. 4to.

§ He was Bishop of Llandaff from 1617 to 1619, and of Chichester from 619 to 1628.

"That opinion, which teaches that Sacraments confer grace upon one who places no bar in their way, by the virtue of the work done, without any good and deserving motion, seems to have arisen about the age of John Scotus. Aquinas seems to have added some stones to this building when he taught, 'that the Sacraments of the New Law cause grace after the manner of an instrument.' (3 par. q. 62. Artic. 1.) These words gave occasion to the Sophists that followed to philosophize after their manner. But Aquinas has nothing about the work done, or about a bar. These things seem to have been added by those that came after. And thus the Tridentine creed, like a patched coat made up of many and various rags, was at length put together and became one. Before these times this opinion was unheard of in the Church of Rome."*

Consequently our divines who have maintained this notion of the Sacraments conferring grace *ex opere operato,* upon all *non ponentibus obicem,* have placed themselves in the unenviable position of supporting the corruptions introduced by the later Scholastic divines, and confirmed by the Tridentine, against the sounder views of even the earlier Scholastics themselves, who (as we have already seen by the extracts given in a preceding chapter from Peter Lombard†) advocated doctrine of a totally different kind. Painful indeed is it, to see the way in which a large body of our divines have, for a long period, retrograded from the ground taken up at the Reformation, and relapsed into various Popish errors. And still more painful, to see them so ill-informed or so wanting in conscientiousness, as to turn round upon the true successors of the Reformers, and (as Bishop Abbot says, *nescio qua fronte*) accuse them of not holding the doctrines of the Formularies drawn up by those very men whose doctrine these accusers have notoriously deserted.

---

* Opinio ista, quæ docet sacramenta conferre gratiam ex vi operis operati sine bono motu meritorio non ponenti obicem, circa Joannis Scoti sæculum enata videtur. Aquinas ad hanc structuram lapides quosdam attulisse videtur, quum docuerit: 'Sacramenta novæ legis gratiam causare per modum instrumenti.' (3 Par. q. 62. Artic. 1.) Hæc occasionem Sophistis insequentibus dederunt philosophandi suo more. Verum Aquinas nihil habet de opere operato, aut de obice. Hæc addita videntur a posterioribus. Atque ita fides Tridentina tanquam ramosa tunica ex multis et variis panniculis consarcinata tandem congesta coaluit. Ante hæc tempora inaudita erat hæc opinio in Ecclesia Romana." (Consensus Eccles. Cathol. contra Tridentinos. Franc. 1613. 8vo. p. 421, 422.)

† See pp. 28–32 above.

I have thought it right to make these remarks at the very outset of our review of the statements of our early divines on the subject of this work, in order that the reader may bear in mind throughout, that the assertion,—that the Sacraments confer grace upon all not putting a bar in the way, and consequently that the general statements of our divines as to the effects of baptism, though to be understood with limitations in the case of adults, are to be considered as applicable in their full force to *all* infants,—is wholly unwarranted, and directly opposed to the doctrine of our most learned divines of the school of the Reformers.

It is undeniable, (and undisputed among us but by a few not worth notice,) that faith and repentance are absolutely necessary in an *adult* coming to baptism, that he may experience the salutary effects of that ordinance; and consequently that all general statements as to the effects of baptism must be interpreted *conditionally* in his case. This is distinctly laid down in Scripture, and from it by our Church in her 25th and other Articles. So therefore in the case of *infants*, it is reasonable to conclude that there is a distinction in the eye of God; especially when we remember, that a large number of them remain to the end of their lives impenitent and unbelieving. Upon what such a distinction may be grounded, is another question. On this point men attached to different doctrinal systems will take different views. But, clearly, we have not the smallest right to assume, that God will in all such cases confer the gift of spiritual regeneration. Scripture is altogether silent upon the point. And so (as usual where such is the case) is our Church. But when we find her specifically demanding a promise of future faith and repentance to be exercised by the child when grown up, and giving baptism to none likely to reach that age without that promise being made, we reasonably infer, that she, *at least*, limits the baptismal blessing to those who, as adults, fulfil that promise.

The faith of the parent is accepted on behalf of the child as giving it a title to baptism, in the same way as the adult's profession of faith is accepted as his title to baptism. All who profess faith and repentance are entitled to baptism at our hands. And all infants brought by professedly believing parents are

similarly entitled to it. But, in both cases, some receive it without profit, and we leave judgment upon this point to God. The faith of the parent does not entitle the child to spiritual regeneration and all its consequent blessings. Such a supposition would be as unwarrantable as that of the Jews of old, who, because they were the seed of Abraham and were circumcised, thought that they must in consequence be necessarily the children of God. It would be making God's best gifts dependent upon the course of human generation; for baptism is in the power of all. But the seed of believing parents are baptized as the children of the Jews were circumcised, and out of them God has a seed to serve him. As among the Jews there were some that had the true circumcision of the heart, and the others had only the outward form "in the letter;" so among us there are some who have the true ablution of the heart and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and others who have but the outward sign. And in the case of infants we leave it to the judgment of God to distinguish between the two, and moreover to pronounce *the grounds of the distinction.*

No doubt, infants are so far interested in their parents' faith, that they may be reckoned by us, as infants, as being acceptable in the eye of God (the Apostle calling them holy); and if they die in infancy, are partakers, as such, of the full baptismal blessing. Nor need we, I think, be anxious to deny, that, in the case of infants, there *may* always be bestowed the pardon of original sin. And when the term regeneration is applied in this sense, by those who speak of the universal regeneration of infants in baptism, and the distinction is preserved between this infantine regeneration and that regeneration of heart which is necessary for the salvation of an adult, then (whether or not we agree in the view taken) it seems very unnecessary to raise a further controversy. But that spiritual regeneration of the heart of which Scripture speaks, and which sanctifies the adult, is a gift not conferred by God in consequence of a parent's faith, but according to his own good pleasure.

To return then to Cranmer, it is clear, that while no *direct* testimony can be obtained from his writings, respecting the particular case of infants, his subject not leading him any where

to this point, his *general doctrine* is directly opposed to the view that all infants are spiritually regenerated in baptism.

Before, however, we quit the writings of Archbishop Cranmer, there is another work, whose testimony on this subject ought to be noticed, which, though not written by him, was drawn up under his eye, and corrected by him, namely, the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum." The history of this work I have already noticed in a former chapter,* and the authors employed to write it are a pretty plain indication of Cranmer's sentiments. Its statements are (in conformity with the usual course adopted by our Reformers) more general and indefinite than might have been desired. But still the doctrine inculcated is sufficiently clear in its opposition to modern "High Church" notions.

Thus, speaking of errors on the subject of Baptism, it says,—

"Moreover many more errors are heaped up by others on the subject of Baptism, which some regard with so much awe and wonder as to believe that the Holy Spirit emerges from that external element itself, and that his influence, power, and virtue by which we are new created, and the grace and other gifts proceeding from him, swim in the very waters of Baptism. In short they hold that our whole regeneration is due to that sacred fount which is manifest to our senses. But the salvation of our souls, the renovation of our spirit, and the blessing of adoption, by which God acknowledges us as sons, proceed from the divine compassion flowing to us through Christ, as also from the promise to be found in the Holy Scriptures."†

The work then proceeds to deny the *necessity* of baptism for the salvation of infants, in a passage already quoted in a former page.‡

---

* See pp. 57 and 73, above.

† Plures item ab aliis cumulantur errores in baptismo, quem aliqui sic attoniti spectant, ut ab ipso illo externo credant elemento Spiritum Sanctum emergere, vimque ejus, nomen et virtutem ex qua recreamur, et gratiam et reliqua ex eo proficiscentia dona in ipsis baptismi fonticulis innatare. In summa totam regenerationem nostram illi sacro puteo deberi volunt, qui in sensus nostros incurrit. Verùm salus animarum, instauratio spiritus, et beneficium adoptionis, quo nos Deus pro filiis agnoscit, a misericordia divina per Christum ad nos dimanante, tum etiam ex promissione sacris in Scripturis apparente proveniunt. (Reform. Leg. Eccles. Lond. 1640. 4to. Tit. de haeres. c. 18, pp. 16, 17.)

‡ See p. 206, 207, above.

Again; its definition of a Sacrament is as follows;—

"*What a Sacrament is.* A Sacrament (in the sense in which we understand it in this place) is a visible sign instituted by God, by which the grace brought to us by the promises and merits of Christ, and the express pardon of sins remitted through them, is signed and sealed; which has a double effect in our minds. For first the reception of those external things both recalls to our minds the value of the effects properly attributed to them, a recovery of our salvation, and causes us openly to testify to its value; and moreover it sharpens and excites our faith, and adds strength to it. Moreover it unites us together in mutual charity, and pours forth the fear of God in our minds. Lastly it rouses us to sincerity and integrity of life. Of this kind was circumcision in former times. Now Baptism and the Eucharist have succeeded to it."*

The description here given of the nature and effects of the Sacraments is clearly very different from that of our modern "High-Church-men."

The requisites to a Sacrament are thus stated;—

"*What is to be sought in a Sacrament.* For the perfection of a Sacrament three things ought to concur. The first is a manifest and notable mark which can be clearly discerned. The second is the promise of God, which is represented to us by an external sign, and thus plainly confirmed. The third is the precept of God, by which the necessity is laid upon us of partly doing those things and partly commemorating them; and since these three things are to be found on the authority of the Scriptures only in Baptism and the Eucharist, we maintain that these two only are true and proper sacraments of the New Testament."†

Baptism is defined thus;—

"*What Baptism is.* Baptism is a sacrament by which our second

---

* *Quid sit Sacramentum.* Sacramentum (quomodo nos illud in hoc loco capimus) signum est institutum a Deo quod videri potest, quo gratia Christi promissis et meritis ad nos profecta, condonatioque peccatorum ipsis remissorum expressa consignatur, quod duplicem in animis nostris vim habet. Primum enim horum externorum sumptio, et attributarum illis proprie virtutum nobis recuperatæ salutis nostræ pretium in memoriam revocat, et id, ut aperte profiteamur, efficit, deinde fidem acuit, et excusitat, et illi robur addit. Præterea charitate nos mutua conserit, et in mentibus nostris Dei timorem effundit. Postremo vitam ad sinceram et integram extimulat. Ex hoc genere circumcisio priscis temporibus erat. Nunc Baptismus et Eucharistia successerunt. (Ib. De Sacram. c. 1. p. 28.)

† *Quid in sacramento quærendum sit.* Ad sacramenti perfectionem tria concurrere debent. Primum evidens est et illustris nota quæ manifeste

birth is sealed to us by external washing, and pardon of sins is granted, and the influence of the Holy Spirit is poured into us, as is contained and set forth in the words used in the rite of Baptism, that our faith may be more elevated and perfect. But when we are dipped under the waters, and rise again out of them, Christ's death and burial are first brought to our view, then his quickening and return to life, that we may bring to mind by these memorials his death and life, and openly testify that sin lies dead and buried in us, and that the new and salutary Spirit of God lives again and flourishes in us; and that, our body being outwardly washed with the external waters, our souls inwardly, the pollutions of sin being washed away, raise themselves pure and thoroughly cleansed to the eternal and heavenly shores."*

Here, as in our 27th Article, the previous possession of faith and the Holy Spirit is supposed, and the new birth is *externally sealed* by baptism, (externa consignatur conspersione), pardon and grace are given, and there is a *revival* of the work of God's Spirit within us (Dei Spiritum *reviviscere* in nobis). These words probably were intended to apply more particularly to the case of adults. And that of infants is left to be inferred from them by analogy.

In this work, then, we have another illustration of Cranmer's views. And we find reason to draw the same conclusion as to them, as that to which his other works have led us.

It is worth notice also that when a treatise of Bullinger's on the Sacraments was shown to Cranmer by John a Lasco, he

---

cerni possit. Secundum est Dei promissum, quod externo signo nobis repræsentatur, et plane confirmatur. Tertium est Dei præceptum, quo necessitas nobis imponitur, ista partim faciendi, partim commemorandi: quatria, cum authoritate Scripturarum in Baptismo solum occurrant et Eucharistia, nos hæc duo sola pro veris et propriis Novi Testamenti Sacramentis ponimus. (Ib. c. 2. pp. 28, 29.)

* *Quid sit Baptismus.* Baptismus est sacramentum, quo secunda generatio nostra nobis *externa consignatur conspersione*, veniaque peccatorum indulgetur, et Spiritus Sancti virtus infunditur, quemadmodum verbis comprehensum est in Baptismo propositis, *ut erectior in nobis et perfectior esset fides.* Dum autem in aquas demergimur, et rursus ex illis emergimus, Christi mors primùm et sepultura commendatur, deinde suscitatio quidem illius, et reditus ad vitam, ut istius mortis et vitæ monumentis recordemur, et palàm testificemur peccatum in nobis mortuum et sepultum jacere, sed novum et salutarem Dei Spiritum *reviviscere* in nobis et *reflorescere*: tinctoque forìs externis aquis corpore, nostras intùs animas, abstersis peccatorum sordibus, puras et perpurgatas ad æternas et cœlestes oras se attollere. (Ib. c. 3. p. 29.)

urged its publication, though he had not read it, observing that Bullinger's writings "needed no inspection."* Now though this fact does not make Cranmer responsible for all Bullinger's statements in that work, it is a strong testimony that he considered Bullinger's doctrine on the subject of the sacraments (which must have been well known to him) to be sound. And what that doctrine was, needs no proof. The reader, however, who wishes for further information respecting it, will find ample extracts a few pages hence from his "Decads."†

BISHOP RIDLEY;

Bishop of Rochester from 1547 *to* 1550, *and of London from* 1550 *till deprived by Mary. Martyr* 1555.

Bishop Ridley, though, like the rest, he describes baptism as man's "regeneration when he is received into the Holy Catholic Church of Christ," yet in the context he speaks of "that good word of God" "*whereby* the man is *born anew* and made the child of God; that seed of God, whereby the man of God, *so being*

* Libellus tuus de Sacramentis ante triennium ad me missus jam tandem sub prelo est. Ubi ad me cum reliqua Bibliothecæ meæ parte nuper advectus esset, exhibui illum D. Cantuariensi. Is vero ubi audisset, nondum esse editum, voluit ut ederetur, etiamsi non legisset, hoc addens, Tua nulla indigere inspectione. J. a Lasco Ep. ad Bulling. ser. Apr. x. 1551. in Gerdes. Scrin. Antiq. sive Miscell. Groning. vol. 4, pp. 470, 471. To this testimony of Cranmer's approval of Bullinger's doctrine, my attention was directed, since the First Edition of this Work, by the Rev. G. C. Gorham.

† Bullinger's Treatise on the Sacraments, shown to Cranmer by John a Lasco, was published by the latter at London in April 1551, 16mo. Of this peculiarly rare work I fortunately possess a copy, and find it to be substantially the same as Sermons vi. and vii. of the fifth Decad, published about the same time by Bullinger himself. There are passages in each not to be found in the other, but the doctrine of Bullinger on the subject is as clearly and fully stated in one as in the other. A Lasco, when sending a copy of his edition to Bullinger, writes, "Libellum ad te tuum de Sacramentis, quem ante triennium ad me miseras, et nunc demum *quintæ decadi tuæ inseruisti*, per manus Domini a Bredam, fratris Domini Falesii, ad te misi, hic, me autore, sed valde incorrecte excusum; non putarem enim, te istic illum editurum esse, cum tanto tempore apud me, præter meam interim voluntatem, delituisset." (Ep. ser. Jun. 7, 1551. in Gerdes. Scrin. Antiq. iv. 472.) If Cranmer had read the Treatise on the Sacraments, and definitely committed himself to an approval of its statements, it would have been worth while to have given extracts from this work. But as Cranmer's words refer only in general terms to Bullinger's views, Cranmer's approval, so far as it goes, applies as much to Bullinger's own edition of his work in the Decads as to that published by John a Lasco.

born, cannot sin ;"* evidently showing, that he did not consider the spiritual new birth as due to baptism alone. The words are the same as those used by Bishop Latimer, in a passage which I shall immediately give, in opposition to the Popish doctrine on the subject.

BISHOP LATIMER ;

Bishop of Worcester from 1535 *to* 1539. *Martyr* 1555.

The following decisive passages will at once show us the views of the venerable Latimer.

"Our Saviour saith to Nicodeme, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit*, 'Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' But how cometh this regeneration? *By hearing and believing of the word of God :* for so saith St. Peter, *Renati non ex semine mortali corruptibili ;* 'We are born anew, not of mortal seed, but of immortal, by the word of God.' Likewise Paul saith in another place, *Visum est Deo per stultitiam prædicationis salvos facere credentes ;* 'It pleased God to save the believers through the foolishness of preaching.' "†

And in another place he speaks still more strongly.

"It is declared," he says, "in many places of Scripture, how necessary preaching is; as this, *Evangelium est potentia Dei ad salutem omni credenti ;* 'The preaching of the Gospel is the power of God to every man that doth believe.' He means God's word opened : it is the instrument, and the thing whereby we are saved. Beware, beware, ye diminish not this office ; for if ye do, ye decay God's power to all that do believe. Christ saith, consonant to the same, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit e supernis, non potest videre regnum Dei :* 'Except a man be born again from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' He must have a regeneration. And what is this *regeneration ? It is not to be christened in water, as these firebrands* [the Romanists] *expound it, and nothing else.* How is it to be expounded then? St. Peter sheweth that one place of Scripture declareth another. It is the circumstance, and collation of places, that makes Scripture plain. *Regeneramur autem*, saith St. Peter,

* Works, P. S. ed. 56, 57. † Sermons, P. S. ed. vol. i. p. 471.

'And we be born again.' How? *Non ex semine mortali, sed immortali:* 'Not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal.' What is this immortal seed? *Per sermonem Dei viventis;* 'By the word of the living God;' *by the word of God preached and opened. Thus cometh in our new birth.*"*

BISHOP HOOPER;

Bishop of Gloucester from 1550, *and of Worcester from* 1552 *till deprived by Mary* 1553. *Martyr* 1554.

"The office of a Sacrament," says Bishop Hooper, "is this: to shew unto us outwardly that the merits of Christ is [are] made ours, for the promise sake which God hath made unto those that believe; and these Sacraments by faith doth applicate and apply outwardly unto him that *in faith receiveth them* the same grace, the mercy, the same benefits that is represented by the Sacraments, but not so by the ministration of the Sacraments, as though they that receive them were not before assured of the same graces and benefits represented by the Sacraments. That were a manifest error: for in case the Sacraments could give us very Christ, the promise of God were in vain, the which always *appertain unto the people of God before they receive any Sacrament;* but they be the testimonies of promise, and declare unto us for an infallible verity, and unto the Church of Christ, that we be the people that God hath *chosen unto his mercy*, and that by faith we possessed *before* Christ; and in faith, friendship, and amity with God we receive these Sacraments, which are nothing else but a badge and open sign of God's favour unto us, and that we by this livery declare ourselves to live and die in his faith againt the devil, the world, and sin." . . . "This [baptism] is the sign wherewithal God marketh all that be living in this world; and his friends by those means he sealeth in the assurance of remission of sin, which thou hast *first in spirit received by faith*, and for the promise made unto thy father and his posterity. For the promise of God, the remission of sin, appertaineth not only unto the father, but also unto the seed and succession of the father, as it was said unto Abraham, Gen. xvii., *Ero Deus tuus, et seminis tui post te.* It is ill done to condemn the infants of the Christians that die without baptism, of whose salvation by the Scripture we be assured." . . "This Sacrament, and all other, be but the confirmation of Christ's pro-

* Ib. p. 202.

mises, *which be in the person that receiveth the Sacraments before, or else these external signs availeth nothing.* This may be easily known by the use of baptism everywhere. The testimonies of *the infant* to be christened are examined in the behalf of the child, of *faith*, what they believe of God. . . . Before yet or he [that is, even he, the infant] be christened, he maketh this solemn vow, full little regarded of all the world in manner, that he *will at the years of discretion practise and live godly after this faith. . . . Then* is he christened in the name of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The which fact doth openly confirm the remission of sin, received before by faith. For at the contemplation of God's promises in Christ, he is saved *as soon as the conscience of man repenteth and believeth,* and his sins be forgiven. John iii. and vi.: Qui credit Filio habet vitam æternam; qui non credit non videbit vitam, sed ira Dei manet super eum. There is neither *faith*, neither *Sacrament*, unto this christened creature in vain. *Faith* receiveth *first* Christ for the promise sake; then is he bold [that is, when in adult life he thus believes] to take *this Holy Sacrament* for a confirmation of God's benefits towards him, and then to manifest, open, and declare unto the whole Church, represented by the minister and such as be present at the act, [referring apparently to the rite of confirmation,] Christ, that already secretly dwelleth in his soul, that they may bear record of this love, amity, peace and concord, that is between God and him by Christ. And forasmuch as all displeasure, ire, vengeance, and hatred, between God and him, is agreed upon by the intercession of Christ, *whom faith* BEFORE BAPTISM *brought before the judgment seat of God, to plead this charter of remission;* it is the office of the Church, which hath an *open and manifest declaration thereof,* to *give God thanks* for the preservation of HIS CHURCH, and for *the acceptation of this christened person into the commonwealth of his saved people.*"——"As the promise of God is received by faith, so must the Sacraments be also. And whereas faith is not, no Sacrament availeth."*

This passage appears to me specially deserving of notice, as explanatory of Hooper's view of *the whole subject* of the effects of baptism in infants. Maintaining that the Sacrament is only the seal and confirmation of what exists before in the person baptized, he goes on to remark that this is true "everywhere," that is, in all cases, even in that of an infant. For the child is

* Answer to Bishop of Winchester (first published in 1547) in his "Early Writings," P. S. ed. pp. 127—135.

examined through its sureties as to its faith, and it is only upon the promise that "he will at the years of discretion practise and live godly after this faith," that he is baptized. And his baptism confirms that remission of sin which even before baptism his anticipated faith had brought him, for even "before baptism" his faith "brought Christ before the judgment seat of God, to plead the charter of remission." And "*as soon as*" his "conscience *repents and believes*," he is "saved," and forgiveness applied to him. And *when* faith has received Christ, *then* he is able to look upon his baptism as "a confirmation of God's benefits towards him," &c. And seeing that even "before baptism," the anticipated faith of the infant "brought Christ before the judgment seat of God to plead the charter of remission," "it is the office of the Church, which hath an open and manifest declaration thereof [that is, of his faith] to *give God thanks* for the preservation of his Church, and for *the acceptation of this christened person into the commonwealth of his saved people*;" in other words, to use such a thanksgiving as our Church prescribes to be used in her Service for the Baptism of Infants.

The same view is also very clearly placed before us in the following passage:—

"Although baptism be a Sacrament to be received and honourably used of all men, yet it sanctifieth no man. And such as attribute the remission of sin unto the external sign do offend. John, Matth. iii., preached penitence in the desert, and remission of sin in Christ. Such as confessed their faults, he marked and declared them to be of Christ's Church. So that external baptism was but an inauguration or external consecration of these, that first believed and were cleansed of their sin, as he declareth himself in the same place: *Ego* (inquit) *baptizo aqua:* I christen with water. As though he said, My baptism maketh no man the better; inwardly, it changeth no man; but I call and preach to the outward ear, I exhort unto penance [*i. e.* repentance]; and such as say they do repent, and would change the old sinful life, I wash with water. He that inwardly cleanseth, is stronger than I. His grace it is only, that purifieth the soul. I baptize in penance, to say, [*i. e.* that is to say,] into a new life. This new life cometh not, until such time as Christ be known and received. Now to put on Christ is to live a new life. Such as be baptized must remember, that penance and faith preceded this external sign, and in Christ the purgation was inwardly obtained, before the external sign

was given. So that there are two kinds of baptism, and both necessary: the one interior, which is the cleansing of the heart, the drawing of the Father, the operation of the Holy Ghost: and this baptism is in man, when he believeth and trusteth that Christ is the only author of his salvation. *Thus be the infants examined concerning repentance and faith, before they be baptized with water;* AT THE CONTEMPLATION OF THE WHICH FAITH, GOD PURGETH THE SOUL. Then is the exterior sign added, not to purge the heart, but to confirm, manifest, and open unto the world that this child is God's. And likewise baptism, with the repetition of the words, is a very sacrament and sign, that the baptized creature should die from sin all his life, as Paul writeth, Rom. vi. Likewise no man should condemn nor neglect this exterior sign, for the commandment's sake: though it have no power to purge from sin, yet it confirmeth the purgation of sin, and the act of itself pleaseth God, for because the receivers thereof obey the will of his commandment."*

Again, in his fifth Sermon on Jonah, he says,—

"They [*i. e.* the Fathers] thought it best to name the Sacraments by the name of the thing was represented by the Sacraments. Yet in many places of their writings they so interpretate themselves, that no man, except he will be wilfully blind, can say but they understood the Sacrament to signify, and not to be the thing signified; to confirm, and not to exhibit grace; to help, and not to give faith; to seal, and not to win the promise of God, Rom. iv.; to shew what we be before the use of them, and not to make us the thing we declare to be after them; to shew we are Christ's; to shew we be in grace, and not by them to be received into grace: to shew we be saved, and not yet to be saved by them; *to shew we be regenerated, and not to be regenerated by them;* thus the old doctors meant."†

These Sermons were preached during Lent 1550, before the King and his Council; and after they were ended he was appointed Bishop of Gloucester.‡ Three editions of the Sermons appeared in the same year.

And in his "Confession of Faith," published in 1550, he says,—

"Of baptism, because it is a mark of our Christian Church, this I

---

* Declaration of Christ and his Office, (first published in 1547). Early Writings, P. S. ed. pp. 74, 75.

† Early Writings, P. S. ed. pp. 523, 524.

‡ See his Letter to Bullinger in "Original Letters relative to the Reformation," P. S. ed. vol. i. p. 87.

judge after the doctrine of St. Paul, that it is a seal and confirmation of justice or of our acceptation into the grace of God. For Christ, his innocency and justice, by faith is ours, and our sins and injustice by his obedience are his, whereof baptism is the sign, seal, and confirmation. For although freely by the grace of God our sins are forgiven, yet the same is declared by the Gospel, received by faith, and sealed by the Sacraments, which be the seals of God's promises, as it is to be seen by the faith of faithful Abraham.... As for those that say circumcision and baptism be like, and yet *attribute the remission of original sin to baptism*, which was never given unto circumcision, they not only destroy the similitude and equality that should be between them, but also take from Christ remission of sin, and translate it unto the water and element of baptism."*

JOHN BRADFORD;

Appointed by Bishop Ridley a Prebendary of St. Paul's.†
Martyr 1555.

Of the character of John Bradford I have already given‡ testimonies amply sufficient, I suppose, for the satisfaction of the reader. A man of whom Bishop Ridley testifies, that he was one "whom in my conscience I judge more worthy to be a Bishop than many a one of us that be Bishops already to be a parish priest," needs no further recommendation to the faithful members of our Church. He is also said by Strype to have been "a man of great learning, elocution, sweetness of temper, and profound devotion towards God....and one of whose worth the Papists themselves were so sensible, that they took more pains to bring him off from the profession of religion than any other,"§ and he, with Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, are called by Strype "four prime pillars of the Reformed Church of England."

Now the writings of Bradford supply us, I conceive, with as complete a view of the doctrine of our Church in his day on the subject of this work as can anywhere be obtained. His general system of doctrine I have already noticed.¶ But I now

* Fathers of the English Church, vol. v. pp. 220—222.
† Strype's Eccles. Mem. III. i. 363.
‡ pp. 79, 80, above.
§ Eccles. Memor. III. i. 364, 364.
‖ Ib. 423.
¶ pp. 75 et seq. above.

come to his statements as to the doctrine of baptism in particular. And the following extracts will show how far he was from supposing that *all* infants *indiscriminately* were regenerated in baptism.

"Our cecity or blindness and corrupt affections do often shadow the sight of God's seed in God's children, as though they were plain reprobates: whereof it cometh, that they praying according to their sense, but not according to the truth, desire of God to give them again his Spirit, as though they had lost it, and he had taken it away; *which thing God never doth indeed, although he make us to think so for a time; for always he holdeth his hand under his children in their falls, that they lie not still, as others do which are* NOT REGENERATE. And this is the difference between *God's children, which are regenerate and elect before all times in Christ*, and the wicked always, that the elect lie not still continually in their sin, as do the wicked, but at the length do *return again by reason of God's seed*, which is in them hid as a spark of fire in the ashes."*

"I believe that faith and to believe in Christ, (I speak not now of faith that men have by reason of miracles. . . . but I speak of *that faith which indeed is the true faith, the justifying and* REGENERATING FAITH), I believe, I say, that this faith and belief in Christ is the work and gift of God, GIVEN TO NONE OTHER THAN TO THOSE WHICH BE THE CHILDREN OF GOD, THAT IS, TO THOSE WHOM GOD THE FATHER, BEFORE THE BEGINNING OF THE WORLD, HATH PREDESTINATED IN CHRIST UNTO ETERNAL LIFE."†

"That election is of some of Adam's posterity, and not of all, we may plainly see it, if we consider, that he maketh the true demonstration of it, believing, hoping, and having the earnest of the Spirit. . . . Who seeth not that these are not common to all men? All men have not faith, saith Paul, 2 Thess. iii. None believed (saith Luke) but such as were ordained to eternal life (Acts iii.); *none believe but such as be born of God* (1 John i.): none believe truly but such as have good hearts, and keep God's seed, to bring forth fruits by patience (Matt. xiii.). So that it is plain (faith being a demonstration of God's election to them that be of years of discretion) that all men are not elect, because all men believe not; for he that believeth in the Lord shall be as Mount Sion (Ps. cxxv.), that is, he shall never be removed; for if he be removed, that is, finally perish, surely *he never truly believed*."‡

---

* Richmond's Fathers of the English Church, vol. vi. pp. 177, 178.
† pp. 188, 189. ‡ Ib. pp. 376, 377.

"If he had not chosen you, as most certainly he hath, he would not have so called you; *he would never have justified you. . . . If he have chosen you. . . . then neither can you, nor ever shall you, perish.*"*

"By faith in Christ. . . . we are members in very deed of the Catholic and Holy Church of Christ. . . . I would the poor Christian conscience, which by baptism is brought into God's Church and made a member of the same THROUGH FAITH, should not for his sins' sake, or for the want of any thing he hath not, despair."†

But Bradford, like all the rest, when speaking of Baptism *in the abstract,* speaks unhesitatingly of the blessings conferred in it.

Thus he says,—

"As by baptism we are engrafted into Christ, so by the Supper we are fed with Christ. . . . As therefore in baptism is given unto us the Holy Ghost, and pardon of our sins, which yet lie not lurking in the water, so in the Lord's Supper, &c. . . . By baptism the old man is put off, and the new man put on; yea, Christ is put on."‡

Again, exhorting his hearers to "discern betwixt signs which *signify only,* and signs which *also* do represent, confirm, and seal up, or (as a man may say) give with their signification," instancing of the former, that "an ivy bush is a sign of wine to be sold," and other examples, which, he says, are "signs significative and shew no gift," he adds,—

"But in the other signs, which some call exhibitive, is there not only a signification of the thing, but also a declaration of a gift, yea, in a certain manner a giving also. As baptism signifieth not only the cleansing of the conscience from sin by the merits of Christ's blood, but also is a very cleansing from sin; and therefore it was said to Paul, that he should arise and wash away his sins, and not that he should arise and take only a sign of washing away his sins."§

And he strongly insists upon a view very generally entertained among our earlier divines,—and which it is essentially necessary to keep in mind as their doctrine, if we would understand aright the language which they often use on the subject of baptism,—

* Ib. p. 103. See also p. 586.

† Against the Fear of Death, ib. p. 414. See also Serm. on Lord's Supper, ib. pp. 498, 499.

‡ Serm. on the Lord's Supper, ib. p. 481. § Ib. pp. 485, 486.

namely, that we who belong to the visible Church, and profess faith in Christ, ought to believe that we are of the number of God's elect children, and shall never finally perish, "faith," as he says in a passage just quoted, "being a demonstration of God's election to them that be of years of discretion." This reliance he considered to be one great mark and characteristic of true faith.

We have already seen how strongly this view was set forth even so early as the year 1537, in the "Institution of a Christian Man;" and Bradford's writings abound with passages to this effect. I will here give a few.

"Now, then, forasmuch as we see faith to be the ground, whereupon dependeth the whole condition of our justifying, let us discuss in like manner what is this faith.... He that believeth that God created all things of nought, believeth truly.... so he that believeth that God hath his election from the beginning, and *that he also is one of the same elect and predestinate,* hath a good belief and thinketh well; but yet this belief alone, except it be seasoned with another thing, will not serve to salvation.... Only the faith which availeth to salvation is that whose object is the body and passion of Jesus Christ crucified."*

Here we see that one part of justifying faith in a man is considered to be the belief "that he is one of the elect and predestinate."

Again, in a "Meditation on the Lord's Prayer," God is thus addressed,—

"*Thou wouldest I should be most assured, that thou of thine own good will which thou barest to me-wards before I was, yea, before the world was, hast in Christ chosen me to be thy child,* and through him art become my most loving Father (Eph. i.), from whom I should look for all good things.... *so certain thou wouldest have me to be of this, that to doubt of it doth most displease thee and dishonour thee.*"† "Last of all, I am taught hereby to see thy goodness towards me, which will deliver me from evil, and from being overcome in temptations; for thou wouldest not have me to ask for that which I should not look for at thy hands certainly. By reason whereof *thou wouldest have me to be in a certainty of salvation for ever.*"‡ "He would not have us to ask for deliverance from evil, if that he

* Letters, i. p. 197. † Ib. p. 236. ‡ Ib. p. 257.

would not we should certainly look for the same. *If thou doubt of final perseverance, thou dishonourest God.*"*

Again, in another Meditation on the Lord's Prayer, he says,—

"In all dangers and perils of temptations, and in the midst of the stormy tempests of tribulation, dear Father, make us, thy poor children, to feel the consolation of *the certainty of our eternal election in Christ Jesus our Lord*, and to perceive thy fatherly succour ready to help us."†

And in his "Defence of Election" he says,—

"*Doubt once of thy salvation, and continue therein, and surely he [the Devil] will ask no more.* It was the first thing wherewith he tempted Christ: 'If thou be the Son of God,' &c. (Matt. iv.) It is the first and principal dart that he casteth at God's elect; but as he prevailed not against Christ, no more shall he do against any of his members."‡

And in his Treatise "Against the Fear of Death,"—

"It is an article of our faith to believe, that is, to be *certain that our sins are pardoned;* therefore doubt not thereof, lest thou become an infidel."§

Again, in one of his Letters, this is very strongly put:—

"If we did certainly believe we were members of Christ and God's temples, how should we but fly from all impurity and corruption of the world which cometh by concupiscence? If we did certainly believe that God indeed of his mercy in Christ is become our Father, in that his goodwill is infinite and his power according thereto, how could we be afraid of man or devil? How could we doubt of salvation, or any good thing which might make to God's glory and our own weal? Now *that we should be certain and sure of this, that we are God's children in Christ, mark whether all things teach us not*.... Besides this, look on your Belief: do you not profess that you believe in God, your Father Almighty, which wanteth no power to help you, as he wanted no good will in Christ to choose you? Do you not say that you do believe remission of sins, resurrection of the body, life everlasting, fellowship with the saints, &c.? But how do you say you believe this gear, and be not *certain thereof? Is not faith a certainty? is not doubting, against faith?* as St. James saith, Pray in faith, and doubt not; for he that doubteth, obtaineth nothing.

---

* Ib. pp. 258, 259. † Ib. p. 314. ‡ Ib. p. 381. § Ib. p. 415.

When Peter began to doubt, he had like to have been drowned (Matt. viii.) ; beware of it therefore."*

Such was the decided language used on this subject by Bradford. And such for a long period was the prevailing doctrine in our Church. It may be added, that this (naturally enough) was one of the first points in the then dominant system of theology, to be afterwards assailed, this being the principal point in which Barret in 1595 departed from the ordinary doctrine of his contemporaries, and for which departure he was called to account.

The consequence of holding this doctrine we see remarkably displayed in the following passages of Bradford relating to baptism, which to one unacquainted with the nature of his doctrine on the subject of Assurance, as just pointed out, would be almost unintelligible. For, maintaining as he did that, in the case of the elect, regeneration was conferred in baptism, and that it is our duty to feel assured of our being in the number of God's elect, he considers that our baptism pledges us to the exercise of such an appropriating faith in God, as having a purpose of mercy towards us, as enables us to look upon ourselves as interested in all the blessings of his promised work of redemption in his people. He remarks,—

"I trust you see, that though the commodities of this life were such as could cause us to love it, yet the brevity, vanity, and misery of it is such, as should make us little to regard it, which believe and know death to be the end of all miseries to *them that are in Christ*, AS WE ALL OUGHT TO TAKE OURSELVES TO BE, *being baptized in his name* (FOR OUR BAPTISM REQUIRETH THIS FAITH UNDER PAIN OF DAMNATION), although we have not observed our profession as we should have done, *if so be we now repent, and come to amendment.*"

Again, while he tells us,—

"Predestination is not without vocation in God's time and justification. . . . Unto the Romans the Apostle sheweth it most manifestly, in saying, Whom he hath predestinated, them he calleth ; whom he calleth, them he justifieth ; whereby we may see that predestination or election is *not universal of all, for all be not justified ;*"‡ and jus-

* Ib. pp. 592, 593. See also p. 93.

† Against the Fear of Death, ib. p. 403. See also the same Treatise, p. 415.

‡ Treatise on Election, ib. p. 378.

tification "*precedeth regeneration*, from which we may discern it, but *not divide it, no more than heat from the fire ;*"*—

He *also* says,—

"A man regenerate (*which we ought to believe of ourselves, I mean that we are so by our baptism, the sacrament thereof requiring no less faith*) ; a man, I say, regenerate, that is, born of God, hath the Spirit of God."†

Thus though he denies that, in fact, all are justified and regenerated, (for he connects the two together), yet at the same time, he maintains that we ought each to believe ourselves to be so ; the characteristic of true faith being, that it realizes a personal interest in the blessings of the Covenant.

Similar passages occur elsewhere in his writings ; as for instance the following :—

"Think that you are regenerate by Christ's resurrection (*whereof your baptism requireth faith*) . . . Think that by faith which is God's seed (for *they which believe are born of God*, and made God's children), *given to those that be ordained to eternal life ;* think, I say, that by faith you receive more and more the spirit of sanctification, through the use of God's word and sacraments."‡

"Thou wouldest that I should be born of Christian parents, brought into thy Church by baptism, and called divers times by the ministry of thy word into thy kingdom, besides the innumerable other benefits always hitherto poured upon me ; all which thou hast done of this *thy good will that thou of thine own mercy bearest to me in Christ and for Christ before the world was made :* THE WHICH THING AS THOU REQUIREST STRAITLY THAT I SHOULD BELIEVE WITHOUT DOUBTING, so in all my needs that I should come unto thee as a Father, and make my moan without mistrust of being heard in thy good time, as most shall make to my comfort."§

And so in the following remarkable passage, where (if there were any doubt as to its meaning), the context (just quoted above) would clear it up.

"A man that is regenerate and born of God (the which thing that every one of us be, our baptism, the sacrament of regeneration, doth require, under pain of damnation ; and therefore let every one of us

* Ib. p. 389. † Ib. p. 390.
‡ Godly Meditation, ib. p. 353.
§ Prayer for Remission of Sins, ib. p. 338.

with the Virgin Mary say, Be it unto me, O Lord, according to thy word, according to the sacrament of Baptism, wherein thou hast declared our adoption: and let us lament the doubting hereof in us, striving against it, as we shall be made able of the Lord): a man, I say, that is regenerate, consisteth of two men (as a man may say), namely of the old man and of the new man."*

Now whatever interpretation may be given to this passage, it is obvious, that it is opposed to the notion of spiritual regeneration being always conferred in baptism, because it argues that baptism requires our regeneration, "under pain of damnation," and exhorts us to pray for it, and lament our doubting whether or not we have it; which (singular as the phraseology is, and whatever may be its precise meaning) is clearly inconsistent with the notion that it is invariably conferred upon the infant as a passive recipient of it. And the context shows that no such meaning was in his mind. For he says,—

"As inasmuch as he is an old man, he is a sinner and an enemy to God, so inasmuch as he is regenerate, he is righteous and holy and a friend to God, *the seed of God preserving him from sin, so that he cannot sin* . . . . . Always he holdeth his hand under his children in their falls, that they lie not still, as others do which are NOT REGENERATE. And this is the difference between *God's children which are regenerate and elect before all times in Christ*, and the wicked always, that the elect lie not still continually in their sin, as do the wicked, but at the length do return again by reason of God's seed, which is in them hid as a spark of fire in the ashes."†

ARCHDEACON PHILPOT;

Archdeacon of Winchester. Martyr 1555.

Archdeacon Philpot also (writing against the Anabaptists) grounds the title of infants of Christian parents to baptism on the fact that they "*be* in the number or scroll of God's people," by promise, and therefore "why should *the sign of the promise* which is baptism in water be withdrawn from children;" "infants be beloved of God, and therefore want not the Spirit of God, *wherefore*" they are to be baptized.‡

* Letter, ib. p. 176. † Ib. pp. 177, 178.
‡ Philpot's Examinations, &c. P. S. ed. See pp. 275—281.

BISHOP COVERDALE;

Bishop of Exeter from 1551 *till deprived by Mary in* 1553.

Thus, again, speaks Bishop Coverdale, as to the intent and effect of baptism :—

"*To use the Sacraments without faith profiteth not, but rather hurteth;* to be loth to use them, declareth a compulsion and unbelief. For though the water in baptism be an outward thing, and cannot cleanse the soul from sin, yet the faithful do know right well, that Christ, the eternal Wisdom in whom they believe, did not institute it in vain; and therefore will not they contemn or leave unexercised the ordinance of their Head, to whom they as members are *incorporated by faith.* For they know, that Christ with these outward tokens thought to couple and knit together the members of his holy Church in obedience and love one towards another; whereby they, knowing one another among themselves, might by such exterior things stir and provoke one another to love and godliness. They know also that sacraments are *evidences of the promise and grace of God,* which they after a visible and palpable manner do *set forth, declare, and represent unto us.* These tokens of grace doth no man use more devoutly, and with more reverence, than he that in himself is certified and assured of the gracious favour of God; as we see in Cornelius, in Paul, and in Queen Candace's chamberlain."*

And with remarkable clearness in the following passage.

First, we have the usual statement as to the excellent effects of baptism in the following words,—

"As *in baptism* we are confirmed and settle ourselves in possession [? persuasion] of *the promise of salvation to appertain unto us, God to be our God, Christ to be our Christ, and we to be God's people;* the promise of the word of God giveth and offereth, faith in us applieth and receiveth the same, and the sacraments do confirm and (as it were) seal up: *baptism, that we are regenerated with the Spirit of God, made his children, brethren to Christ, and engrafted into him;* the supper, that we are fed with Christ spiritually;" &c.†

But then, afterwards, in the same page, we are told,—

"*In baptism is required God's election, if he be an infant, or faith, if he be of age.*"‡

---

* Coverdale's Writings, P. S. ed. p. 411.
† Coverdale's Remains, P. S. ed. pp. 267, 268. ‡ Ib. 268.

THOMAS BECON;

Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer.

Let us first observe how, like all the rest, he unhesitatingly makes general statements, connecting regeneration with baptism.

"Although by Christ we be set again at liberty, and receive our manumission and freedom from that captivity whereunto we were made bond by the sin of Adam, so soon as we are *regenerate and born anew by the honourable sacrament of Baptism and the Holy Ghost*, yet inasmuch," &c.* "By baptism is he your Lord God; therefore will not he suffer you to perish. By baptism is he your Father and you are born of him, and so become his son. . . . By baptism is the Holy Ghost given you: then are you the son of God, and cannot perish," &c.† Baptism "is called the clean and pure water, the lavacre of our regeneration, or fountain of the new birth."‡

But does he mean that *all* that are baptized are regenerated? Nothing of the kind, as we see from such passages as the following.

"St. Paul saith, 'We are the workmanship of God' . . it doth follow, 'created in Christ Jesus.' Behold here is a new creation. Here is another birth. Here is a regeneration which far differeth from the old nativity. Here are we made new creatures. In whom? In Moses by the law? Nay verily, but in Christ by faith. *By faith are we regenerate, born anew, created again in Christ Jesus.*"§

"*Father.* What is it to be baptized with the Holy Ghost? *Son.* To be regenerate, to be born anew, to be made of earthly heavenly, &c. . . . *Father.* Is this baptism of the Spirit necessary unto everlasting salvation? *Son.* So necessary, that without it the baptism of water profiteth nothing. As in the Old Testament the circumcision of the flesh profited the Jews nothing at all without the circumcision of the Spirit, so likewise in the New Testament the baptism of the water availeth nothing without the baptism of the Spirit."‖ "Hereof then may we truly conclude, that, forasmuch as the outward baptism which is done by water, neither giveth the Holy Ghost nor the grace of God, but *only is a sign and token thereof;* if any of the Christian infants, prevented by death, depart without baptism (necessity so

---

* Works, P. S. ed. vol. 1. p. 178.
† Ib. vol. 3. p. 173.
‡ Ib. p. 612.
§ Ib. vol. 1. p. 81.
‖ Ib. vol. 2. pp. 202, 203.

compelling), they are not damned, but be saved by the free grace of God; forasmuch as we tofore heard, they be *contained in the covenant of grace*, they be *members of God's Church*, God promiseth to be their God," &c.* "For, as many of the people of God are saved, which never received the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, so likewise are many saved, though they were never outwardly baptised with water; forasmuch as the regeneration of a Christian consisteth rather in the spirit than in the flesh; even as the circumcision also of the Jews consisted not in the letter, but in the spirit, not in the circumcision of the flesh, but in the circumcision of the heart."†

"What is baptism? The washing of every believing Christian in water that taketh upon him to profess the name of Christ; which water certifieth our faith of the inward washing and cleansing of our souls by the Spirit of God; *a token of our regeneration*, of the mortification of our flesh, of our burial with Christ, and of our resurrection unto a new life. If the believing Christians only be baptized, according to this saying of Christ, 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,' why should the infants be baptized, which for imperfection of age are not able to believe? Though infants have not power to believe or to confess their belief, yet have they *faith imputed unto them for the promise sake of God, because they be the seed of the faithful*; as he said to Abraham, 'I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.' Seeing then that they also have the promise of salvation, why should they be forbidden the promised *pledge or seal* of the same promise of salvation? The sacraments of the Jews differed nothing from ours in effect, but only in the outward element and form of executing the same: why then should our infants be more forbidden baptism than the Jews' infants were forbidden circumcision at the eighth day? . . . . What if the infants die before they receive the sacrament of baptism? God's promise of salvation unto them is not for default of the sacrament minished, or made vain and of no effect. For the Spirit is not so bound to the water, that it cannot work his office, where the water wanteth, *or that it of necessity must alway be there where the water is sprinkled* . . . True Christians, whether they be old or young, are not saved because outwardly they be washed with the sacramental water, but *because they be God's children by election through Christ, yea, and that before the foundations of the world were laid*, and are *sealed up by the Spirit of God unto everlasting life.*"‡

No remarks, I suppose, are necessary to explain Becon's doctrine.

---

* Ib. vol. 2. p. 217. † Ib. p. 224. ‡ Ib. vol. 3, pp. 616, 617.

DEAN W. TURNER;

Dean of Wells from 1550 *to* 1553, *and from* 1560 *to* 1568. *He was also Canon of Windsor in the time of Edward VI.*

The work of Dean Turner* from which I am about to quote is entitled, "The Old Learning and the New compared together, whereby it may easily be known which of them is better and more agreeing with the everlasting word of God. Newly corrected and augmented by William Turner." The colophon of the edition used (from a copy in the British Museum) is, "Imprinted at London by Robert Stoughton. . . . 1548." In 16mo. There was an earlier edition in 1538. The work is a translation of one written in Latin by Urbanus Regius, and though this is not mentioned in the title, it is acknowledged in the heading of the Preface to be a translation, in these words, "The Preface of the Translator unto the Christian reader."

In that part of this work which treats "Of the Sacraments," we have the following comparison.

"The New Learning.

"It is enough and sufficient to receive the Sacraments effectually and with fruit, to have no stop nor let of deadly sin. And there is not required in a man a good motion within him which receiveth them, whereby of a congruence or worthiness he may deserve grace; for the Sacraments bring grace with them of the work that is wrought by them, or by the work itself, that is to say, because the work is showed and ministered as a sign or a Sacrament. Thus saith the Master of Sentences, in the fourth book, in the first distinction."†. . .

---

* As Dr. Turner practised at one time as a physician, doubts have been raised by Wood (ever glad to find something to censure in such men) whether he was ever ordained. It has been proved, however, by Baker, that he was in deacon's orders in 1536, who adds that he was ordained priest by Bishop Ridley, Dec. 21, 1552. See Wood's Athen. Oxon. i. 361, ed. Bliss. Wood admits that he was "a person had in much esteem for his two faculties [divinity and physic], and for the great benefit he did by them, especially in his writings, to the Church and Commonwealth."

† This is a mistake. No such passage occurs in the Master of the Sentences, whose doctrine is much sounder than this. The passage referred to is probably the following, in an Exposition of the Book of the Sentences written by Gabriel Biel, two centuries later.

"Signum aliquod conferre gratiam dupliciter potest intelligi. Uno modo ex ipso signo seu Sacramento, vel ut alii dicunt, ex opere operato;

"The Old Learning.

"The Gospel witnesseth that we be saved, not by an holy sign but through faith; Gen. xv., 'Abraham gave credence, and believed God, and that was reckoned to him for righteousness.' Rom. iv. and x., 'If a man believe from the heart, he shall be made righteous.' He saith not, that with the body an holy sign is taken unto righteousness. Also, Habakkuk ii. and Rom. i., 'The just shall live by his faith.' He saith not, he shall live by the Sacraments. It followeth, therefore, after the Old Learning, that faith is necessary to be had in him that receiveth the Sacrament with fruit. The authors of this Learning that are the youngest wrote 1500 years ago: then judge, I pray thee, good reader, whether our Learning, which was taught only by the Prophets and Apostles so many years ago, ought rather to be called Old Learning, or theirs whose writers wrote not above 500 years past." (fol. A iiii.)

LANCELOT RIDLEY;

Made by Archbishop Cranmer in 1541 *one of the six Preachers at Canterbury Cathedral.*

By the extracts already given from Lancelot Ridley,* it appears that he held with Luther, that faith is necessary even for infants in order to their being accepted by God in baptism. The strong expressions therefore which he uses in the same Treatise respecting the effects of baptism must of course be understood with this condition.

DR. JOHN OLDE, 1550.

Dr. Olde is quoted with respect by Archbishop Bancroft in his celebrated Sermon at Paul's Cross, in 1588, as "*a very learned man*" who had written a work in Defence of the Reformation of the Church by Edward VI.† The title of this work is, "Acquittal

ita quod eo ipso quod opus illud, puta signum aut Sacramentum, exhibetur, nisi impediat obex peccati mortalis, gratia confertur; sic quod præter exhibitionem signi foris exhibiti non requiritur bonus motus interior in suscipiente, quo de condigno vel de congruo gratiam mereatur, sed sufficit quod suscipiens non ponat obicem." (Repertorium generale et succinct. &c. content. in quat. collect. Gabrielis Biel super quat. libr. Sentent. Lugd. 1519, fol. In libr. 4, dist. 1, quæst. 3.)

* See pp. 192, 193, above.

† See reprint of this Sermon in Hickes's Bibliotheca Scriptorum, &c. Lond. 1709. 8vo. p. 281.

or purgation of the most Catholic Christian Prince Edward VI.," printed at Waterford in 1555, 16mo. In it, speaking of baptism, he says,—

"By this baptism we believe that all are baptized to be one body through the Spirit of Christ, and that baptism doth always work effectually *in faithful believers; for Christ doth always water the members of his body with his own Spirit.*" (fol. E iv.)

Here it is evident that the effect of baptism is confined to *faithful believers and members of Christ's body.*

And, again, in his "Confession of the most antient and true Christian Catholic Old Belief," (which professes to be "imprinted in Sothewarke, by Christopher Truthal. In April 1556.") 16mo., commenting on the Creed, he says:—

"Concerning the Ninth Article, I believe and confess, that all they which truly believe in Christ throughout all the whole universal world, are one body and one church of Christ, whom he sanctifieth by his Holy Spirit in his own blood. And all they are with one only bond and knot of faith, and through love, united and knit in Christ, and one to another, among themselves, like members all of one body; and principally they are made partakers of the free grace and gifts of their head and Saviour Jesus Christ. This church is holy, *this church is begotten and born of the word of God recorded in the Holy Scriptures. . .* And because it is *begotten and born of the immortal seed the word of God,* mentioned in the Scriptures, heareth the voice of her head and shepherd, Jesus Christ, fleeth from the voice of all strange doctrines and spirits," &c. (fol. C 2, C 3.)

ROGER HUTCHINSON, 1550.

Roger Hutchinson was a Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and, though a layman, yet of some ecclesiastical learning. In 1550 he published a book entitled "The Image of God, or Layman's Book," which he dedicated to Archbishop Cranmer. From this work passages are sometimes quoted as proving the universal efficacy of baptism to the production of spiritual regeneration. And no doubt there are passages which, speaking of baptism in general terms, connect regeneration with it, as the most Calvinistic divines also do, as has been already shown. But he also tells us that God "is not bound to his Sacraments,

but worketh *what he will and how he will,*" and that He "*regardeth the heart, not the ceremony of ministration.*"*

These words, then, show that his general expressions respecting the effects of the sacraments are to be understood as referring to those cases where the recipients are acceptable in the sight of God.

A SHORT CATECHISM, 1550.

The full title is,

"A shorte Cathechisme. A briefe and godly bringinge up of youth, in the knowlege and commaundementes of God in fayth, prayer, and other articles necessary to be knowen of all those that wil be partakers of the kyngdom of Jesus Christ: set forth in maner of a Dialogue." 16mo.

The colophon is,

"Imprinted the yeare after the creation of the worlde 5525. And after the byrthe of oure Saviour 1550."—(Cambr. Univ. Libr. Q.* 13, 42.)

The author of this Catechism, in his Preface to the reader, says,—

"And because our country is great, and the preachers few, that the word cannot by lively voice be taught in all places: I thought nothing meeter to be set forth at this present time, than this brief Catechism, that where as they can have no preacher, they may notwithstanding not lack a teacher."

I have not been able to ascertain who was the author of this Catechism, and therefore of course, as long as its author remains unknown, its testimony is of a secondary value. But the words of the Preface, just quoted, certainly seem to imply that its author was one whose works would be at least freely allowed to be used.

Thus it speaks on the subject of Baptism.

"T. [Teacher.] Is not baptism a washing away of sins, as Peter saith?

"Ch. [Child.] Not properly, but the Holy Ghost in the Holy Scripture is oft wont to name the outward things, as if they were the things that they betoken. As in the book of creation, circumcision

* Park. Soc. ed. pp. 108, 109.

is called a bundt [covenant], the which is but a token of the bundt. Likewise Moses calleth the Easter-lamb a passing by, and yet it was but a sign of the passing by. So baptism is sometime called a new bearing water, not that we be new born through the outward water, but that it betokeneth the new birth and regeration [regeneration]. Peter saith also: Baptism saveth us, of the which manner of speaking there be many in Scripture." (fol. I iiii.)

The testimonies of Bucer and Peter Martyr, Regius Professors of Divinity at Cambridge and Oxford in the reign of Edward VI., I have given in ch. v., pp. 162 et seq. above.

I now pass on to the divines of the period of Queen Elizabeth. And I would in the first place call the reader's attention to the proofs already given in Chapter III. above, *of the system of doctrine* generally embraced in our Church at that time. Because, while it is impossible to obtain testimonies from many of these divines on the particular subject of the effects of baptism, from the circumstance of its not having been anywhere treated of by them, yet the system of doctrine they held is a sufficient proof of the general character of their views. No man, holding the doctrine called Calvinistic, on the subject of election and final perseverance, can consistently hold that the universal effect of baptism in infants is to produce (in the full and proper sense of the terms) spiritual regeneration. And therefore the proofs already given of the "Calvinistic" views of our Archbishops, Bishops, and University Professors, on these points, are decisive, though indirect, evidences of their *general* doctrine on the subject of Baptism.

From the cause just mentioned, however, I am compelled to pass over many names of those whose general sentiments are well known, and content myself with passages from those who have *happened* to leave behind them some treatise or incidental notice on the particular subject of our present inquiry. And I commence with,—

BISHOP JEWELL;

Bishop of Salisbury from 1559 *to* 1571.

The sanction given by Convocation to his "Apology" entitles him to precedence. Now Bishop Jewell is a witness adduced by

the Bishop of Exeter, in his recent Charge, to show that the Church of England "agrees with Rome" on the doctrine of the gift of spiritual regeneration in baptism. I will therefore first notice the reference made to his writings in support of this view of the effects of baptism. Bishop Jewell, we are told, "in his *Apology for the Church of England*,"—

"While he enlarges on every particular in which we differ from Rome, disposes of baptism, *in which we are agreed*, [!] in a very few lines, merely showing that on this point we hold the faith of the Catholic Church."*

And for proof of this we have the following extracts placed before us.

"Jewell (Apol. Eccl. Ang. par. II.) 'Baptismum quidem Sacramentum esse remissionis peccatorum, et ejus ablutionis, quam habemus in Christi sanguine; et ab eo neminem, qui velit profiteri nomen Christi, ne infantes quidem Christianorum hominum, quoniam nascuntur in peccato, et pertinent ad populum Dei, arcendos esse.' Again,—'Christum enim asserimus, vere sese præsentem exhibere in Sacramentis suis: in Baptismo, ut eum induamus.'"†

The following passage also is quoted from his Treatise on the Sacraments. "They are not bare signs: it were blasphemy so to say. The grace of God doth alway work with his Sacraments."

To which is added the following note;—

"Jewell's Works, fol. Lond. 1609. (Treatise of Sacraments, p. 263.) He adds: 'Chrysostom saith, In nobis non simplex aqua operatur, sed, cum accepit gratiam Spiritus, abluit omnia peccata. So saith Ambrose also: Spiritus Sanctus descendit, et consecrat aquam. So saith Cyril. So saith Leo, sometime a Bishop of Rome. Dedit aquæ quod dedit Matri. Virtus enim Altissimi et obumbratio Spiritus Sancti, quæ fecit, ut Maria pareret, eadem facit, ut regeneret unda credentem.' Presently afterwards, in the same treatise, p. 265, Jewell says;—'I will now speak briefly of the Sacraments in several, and leave all idle and vain questions, and only lay open so much as is needful and profitable for you to know. Baptism, therefore, is our Regeneration or new Birth, whereby we are born anew in Christ, and are made the sons of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven.'"‡

These are the passages upon which his Lordship grounds his claim to the authority of Jewell in his favour. Now the reader

* Charge, 3d. ed. p. 11. † Ib. ‡ Ib.

will at once perceive that there is nothing in this language but what we have already met with in the works of the most "Calvinistic" divines; and the passage from Leo, in which he says, "regeneret unda *credentem*," is precisely in accordance with the views which his Lordship adduces it to refute; and of course illustrates the meaning of the context. The real views of Jewell must be ascertained by a comparison of these with other passages in his works; and such a comparison will show us that the selection here made is altogether partial and delusive. We have Jewell's own testimony, as we have already seen,* written in 1562, contemporaneously with the "Apology," and just after the XXXIX Articles had been agreed to, that he and his brethren in this country did not in the least differ from the doctrine of Peter Martyr.

The Bishop of Exeter quotes two passages from the "Apology." But in the context he would have found others that show at once in what sense they are to be understood.

Thus, it is there said,—

"Recipimus sacramenta Ecclesiæ, hoc est, sacra quædam signa, cæremonias, quibus Christus nos uti voluit, ut illis mysteria salutis nostræ nobis ante oculos constitueret, et *fidem nostram*, quam *habemus* in ejus sanguine, vehementius *confirmaret*, et *gratiam suam* in cordibus nostris *obsignaret*."

That is, according to the translation Jewell himself inserted in the "Defence" of the Apology,—

"Moreover, we allow the Sacraments of the Church, that is to say, certain holy signs and ceremonies, which Christ would we should use, that by them he might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly *confirm the faith which we have* in his blood, and might *seal his grace* in our hearts."†

And a little further on, in words not to be mistaken, he says,—

"*Sine fide* ne vivis quidem prodesse dicimus sacramenta Christi; mortuis vero multo minus."

"We say that the sacraments of Christ, *without faith*, do *not once profit* those that be alive: a great deal less do they profit those that be dead."‡

* See p. 93 above.

† Ch. 10. div. 1. in Defence of the Apology, p. 205. Works, 1611. fol.

‡ Ib. p. 282.

And in his *Defence of the Apology* we find the same doctrine repeatedly insisted on in the clearest terms.

"Without faith of our part," he says, "Sacraments be not only unprofitable to us, but also hurtful."*

And he explains the phrase of grace being given in the Sacraments in this way,—

"Thus the grace of God is given unto us in the Sacraments, because it is represented and laid before us in the Sacraments."

Again,—

"The merits of Christ's death whereof we entreat, are conveyed unto us by God, and received by us. God conveyeth them to us only of his mercy, and we receive them *only by faith*. . . . . Among other causes, the Sacraments serve specially to direct and to aid our faith; for they are, as S. Augustine calleth them, 'Verba visibilia, Visible words,' and seals and testimonies of the Gospel. All this notwithstanding, we say, It is neither the work of the Priest, nor the nature of the Sacrament, as of itself, that maketh us partakers of Christ's death, but *only the faith of the receiver*."†

And speaking of the statements of some of the Fathers that an infant when baptized is accepted on account of the faith of its parents or sponsors, he says,—

"Nevertheless concerning the faith of the parents and others, the holy doctors have sometime written otherwise. S. Augustine saith, Satis pie recteque creditur, prodesse parvulo eorum fidem a quibus consecrandus offertur: It is good and godly to believe that the child is holpen by the faith of them by whom he is offered or brought unto baptism. . . . The like sayings might be alleged out of Justinus Martyr, S. Cyprian, S. Hierome, and others. For thus they write; *How truly I will not say*. But their words be plain. *The prophet Abacuc saith, Justus ex fide sua vivet: The just man shall live, (not by the faith of his parents, but) by his own faith.*"‡

These words, of course, clearly show Jewell's own view of the case.

---

* Defence of the Apology, p 207. Works, ed. 1611. fol.

† Ib. p. 284.

‡ Ib. p 217. Jewell, doubtless, did not here mean to deny that an infant dying in infancy receives benefit from the faith of a parent, but only that, in baptism, one whom God foresees will grow up and remain impenitent and unbelieving is made a living member of Christ's mystical body, the true Church, through a parent's faith.

Again, in his Reply to Harding's Answer to the challenge he gave the Papists in his famous sermon at Paul's Cross in 1560, he maintains the same doctrine.

After having remarked,—

"It is granted of all, without contradiction, that one end of all Sacraments is to join us unto God:"*

He adds almost immediately after,—

"Howbeit, in plain speech, it is not the receiving of the Sacrament that worketh our joining with God. For whosoever is not joined to God before he receive the Sacraments, he eateth and drinketh his own judgment. *The Sacraments be seals and witnesses, and not properly the causes of this conjunction.*"†

Again,—

"We confess that Christ by the Sacrament of Regeneration, as Chrysostome saith, hath made us flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, that we are the members and he is the head. We confess also, that all the faithful are one body, all indued with one spirit. And be that distance never so great, yet are we one another's members. *This marvellous conjunction and incorporation is first begun and wrought by faith*, as saith Paulinus unto S. Augustine; Per fidem nostram incorporamur in Christo Jesu Domino nostro: By our faith we are incorporate or made one body with Jesus Christ our Lord. *Afterward the same incorporation is assured unto us, and increased in our baptism.*"‡

Here is a broad and general principle laid down, which of course must apply in its measure to the case of infants as well as to that of adults. Whether we suppose that the seed of faith is implanted in the infant previous to baptism, or whether we hold that the prevision of future faith and repentance avails in the case of an infant, or whatever other theory may be adopted, it is clear that upon the principle advanced here by Jewell, a child is not necessarily regenerated and made a member of Christ because it is baptized.

Again, he says,—

"Our doctrine is, that the Sacraments of Christ, unto the godly are the instruments of the Holy Ghost: and unto the wicked are increase of further judgment."§

---

* Reply unto M. Harding's Answer, p. 20. Works, ed. 1611. fol.
† Ib. p. 21 ‡ Ib. p. 27. § Ib. p. 64.

Again,—

"Likewise in baptism, as the one part of that holy mystery is Christ's blood, so is the other part the material water. Neither are these parts joined together in place, but in mystery: and therefore *they be oftentimes severed, and the one is received without the other.*"*

The same is the doctrine of Jewell's "Treatise of the Sacraments," and the expressions quoted from it by the Bishop of Exeter are nothing more than what are common in authors of that period *confessedly* opposed to the Bishop's views. It is quite admitted that the Sacraments are not bare signs, and that God always works with his Sacraments, *when the recipients are acceptable in his sight.* And this limitation Jewell himself constantly insists upon; and if he had not, and the words quoted by the Bishop were to be understood without any limitation, they would be directly opposed to the 25th Article. And so also, in the sense in which Jewell himself explains the matter, baptism is admitted to be our regeneration or new birth.

There is another passage in the same Treatise, still stronger perhaps than those quoted by the Bishop, but the meaning of which is, to one who is acquainted with the theology of the period, perfectly clear.

---

* Ib. p 285. Other passages are often quoted on the subject from this Work, but they refer more particularly to a point which (though I have already observed with regret, pp. 35, 36, above, that it is not wholly without defenders among us) I think it unnecessary to discuss, namely, whether the virtue of the Sacraments is infused into the elements so as to be communicated physically by them to the receiver. The great body of the Romanists for the last three or four centuries seem to have held the affirmative view. And consequently Jewell earnestly opposes it. And when the Bishop of Exeter disclaims the view that "the Sacraments, by power that they have of themselves, apart from the effectual operation of God in and by them, contain the grace of which they are the signs" (Charge, p. 11, Note), I suppose he means to oppose the doctrine of which we are speaking; though his words might have been clearer.

On this account I have not quoted the following passage, because it is written with reference to the point just mentioned. "Verily to ascribe felicity, or remission of sin, which is the inward work of the Holy Ghost, unto any manner outward action whatsoever, it is a superstitious, a gross, and a Jewish error." (Reply to Harding, p. 442.) I must add, however, that to suppose that the spiritual effect always *accompanies* the outward action, is in fact much the same as to suppose that the spiritual effect is always *produced* by the outward action, because even in the latter case it is only supposed to take place through Divine influence. For other passages, see Reply to Harding, pp. 339 and 458.

"In baptism," he says, "the nature and substance of water doth remain still: and yet is not it bare water. It is changed [i. e. in its character and uses] and made the Sacrament of our regeneration. It is water consecrated, and made holy by the blood of Christ. They which are washed therein, are not washed with water, but in the blood of the unspotted Lamb. One thing is seen, and another understood. We see the water, but we understand the blood of Christ. Even so we see the bread and wine, but with the eyes of our understanding we look beyond these creatures; we reach our spiritual senses into heaven, and behold the ransom and price of our salvation. We do behold in the Sacrament, not what it is, but what it doth signify. When we receive it with due reverence and faith, we say, as said Gregorius Nyssenus, Ego aliam escam agnosco, quæ, &c. (De crea. hom. cap. 20.) 'I know another kind of meat, bearing the likeness and resemblance of our bodily meat, the pleasure and sweetness whereof passeth only into the soul.' It goeth not into the mouth or belly, but only into the soul, and it feedeth the mind inwardly, as the other outwardly feedeth the body."*

But who are those who are thus "washed in the blood of the Lamb?" Are we to conclude from these words, because the expressions are general, that everybody that comes to baptism is so washed. No! no more than from the latter part of the paragraph we should maintain that the bread and wine "feed the mind inwardly" of everybody that partakes of the Lord's Supper.

The real character and use of the Sacraments, and the limitations with which such passages are to be understood, are abundantly set forth in other parts of the same Treatise; as in the following passages.

"Christ hath ordained them, [i. e. Sacraments,] that by them he might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly *confirm the faith which we have* in his blood, and might *seal his grace* in our hearts."†

"The signification and the substance of the Sacrament, is to shew us, how we are washed with the passion of Christ, and how we are fed with the body of Christ. . . . And because of this likeness which they have with the things they represent, they be oftentimes *termed by the names of the things themselves.*"‡

* Treatise of the Sacraments, p. 274. Works, ed. 1611. fol.
† Ib. p. 261. ‡ Ib. p. 262.

But,—

"If any man have *the outward seal*, and have not *the faith thereof* sealed within his heart, *it availeth him not*."*

"When one that is unlearned, and cannot read, looketh upon a book, be the book never so true, never so well written, yet because he knoweth not the letters, and cannot read, he looketh upon it *in vain*. .... So do the faithful receive the fruit and comfort by the Sacraments, which the wicked and ungodly neither consider nor receive."†

"It is the covenant and promise and mercy of God which clotheth us with immortality; assureth our resurrection, by which we receive regeneration, forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. His word declareth his love towards us: and that word is sealed and made good by baptism. Our faith, which are baptized, and our continuance in the profession which we have made, establisheth in us this grace which we receive. As it is said: Verus Baptismus constat non tam &c. True baptism standeth not so much in washing of the body, as in *the faith of the heart*. De consecrat. Dist. 4. *Verus*. As the doctrine of the Apostles hath taught us, saying, 'By faith purifying their hearts.' Acts xv. And in another place: 'Baptism saveth us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the examining of a good conscience before God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. 1 Pet. iii. Therefore Hierome saith: They that receive not baptism with perfect faith, receive the water, but the Holy Ghost they receive not. In Eze. ca. xvi."‡

"*The Sacrament maketh not a Christian*, but is a seal and assurance unto all that receive it of the grace of God, unless they make themselves unworthy thereof, and that no man may despise this holy ordinance, and keep back his infants from baptism, for in so doing he procureth his own damnation. In time of ignorance many could see this, and acknowledge it, that the outward baptism by water was not necessary unto salvation, so that the children or others that died without were for lack thereof damned. The Church hath always received three sorts of baptism: the baptism of the Spirit, or of blood, or of water. If any were prevented by death, or hindered by cruelty or persecution, so that they could not receive the Sacrament of Baptism at the hands of the minister, yet *having the sanctification of the Holy Ghost*, or making their faith known by their suffering, they were *born anew and baptized*."§

And then he adds words which evidently show that he took (as might be expected from his Letter to Peter Martyr, above

* Ib. p. 262. † Ib. p. 263. ‡ Ib. p. 266. § Ib. p. 267.

(quoted) precisely the view of the foreign Calvinistic Reformers on the subject.

"God hath his purpose in us and our children. Before we be born, when he [we] had done neither good nor evil, he hath mercy and compassion on us. Judgment appertaineth unto God. He knoweth who are his. No man knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God only. And thus much of the Sacrament of Baptism, which is *the badge and cognizance of every Christian*. If any be not baptized, but lacketh the mark of God's fold, we cannot discern him to be one of the flock. If any take not *the seal of regeneration*, we cannot *say*, he is born the child of God."*

With these passages I leave the testimony of Jewell in the hands of the reader.

I pass on to,—

DEAN NOWELL'S CATECHISM;

Dean of St. Paul's from 1560 *to* 1604.

I rank the testimony of Dean Nowell's Catechism next, because it was revised and approved in the Convocation of 1562, and was formally sanctioned by a Canon of the Convocation of 1571; and may therefore be considered as a work recognised by public authority as speaking the sentiments of our Church. As such, it is referred to by the Bishop of Exeter himself,† who (as I have pointed out in a former work‡) being entirely unconscious that great part of this work is taken almost *verbatim* from Calvin's Catechism, has committed the singularly infelicitous mistake of referring to words taken from Calvin's Catechism as an undeniable proof that Nowell's Catechism supports his views. In a former part of this work,§ I have given some extracts illustrating the general system of doctrine advocated in Nowell's Catechism, which has been shown to be that commonly called Calvinistic. I have now to add that portion of the Catechism relating to the subject of baptism.‖

---

* Ib. p. 267. † See his recent Charge, p. 11.
‡ Vindication of Defence of XXXIX Articles, pp. 16, 17.
§ See pp. 88—91 above.
‖ I quote from the Edition by Bishop Cleaver, Oxon. 1795, 8vo. pp. 156—161.

I shall first give that part of it which has been quoted by the Bishop of Exeter, as maintaining his view, annexing in a parallel column the passages of Calvin's Catechism from which it is taken.

Nowell's Catechism.	Calvin's Catechism.
M. Quæ est arcana et spiritualis gratia [in Baptismo]?	M. Quæ est Baptismi significatio?
A. Ea duplex est; remissio videlicet peccatorum, et regeneratio, quæ utraque in externo illo signo solidam et expressam *effigiem* suam tenent.	P. Ea duas habet partes. Nam ibi remissio peccatorum, deinde *spiritualis regeneratio figuratur.*
M. Quomodo?	M. Quid similitudinis inest aquæ cum his rebus, ut eas repræsentet?
A. Primum, quemadmodum sordes corporis aqua, ita animæ maculæ per remissionem peccatorum eluuntur; deinde regenerationis initium, id est, naturæ nostræ mortificatio. vel immersione in aquam, vel ejus aspersione *exprimitur.* Postremo vero, quum ab aqua, quam ad momentum subimus, statim emergimus, nova vita, quæ est regenerationis nostræ pars altera atque finis, *repræsentatur.*	P. *Peccatorum quidem remissio species est lavacri, quo animæ suis maculis absterguntur, non secus atque aqua abluuntur corporis sordes.* M. Quid de regeneratione? P. Quoniam *ejus initium est naturæ nostræ mortificatio,* finis vero, ut novæ creaturæ simus: in eo nobis proponitur mortis figura, quòd capiti aqua injicitur; novæ autem vitæ, in eo quòd non manemus sub aqua demersi, sed ad momentum duntaxat subimus, tanquam in sepulcrum, ut statim emergamus.
M. Videris aquam effigiem tantùm quandam rerum divinarum efficere.	M. Verum, annon aliud aquæ tribuis nisi ut ablutionis tantùm sit figura?
A. *Effigies* quidem est, sed minime inanis, aut fallax, ut *cui rerum ipsarum veritas adjuncta sit atque annexa.* Nam *sicuti Deus peccatorum condonationem, et vitæ novitatem nobis verè in baptismo offert, ita a nobis certo recipiuntur.* Absit enim, ut Deum vanis nos imaginibus ludere atque frustrari putemus. [*The italics here are the Bishop's.*]*	P. Sic figuram esse sentio ut simul annexa sit veritas. Neque enim, sua nobis dona pollicendo, nos Deus frustratur. Proinde et peccatorum veniam et vitæ novitatem offerri nobis in Baptismo, et recipi a nobis certum est.

* "M. What is the secret and spiritual grace [in Baptism]?

"A. It is twofold; namely remission of sins and regeneration, both which have in that external sign their full and express *representation.*

"M. How so?

"A. First as the uncleannesses of the body are washed away with water, so the spots of the soul are washed away by the remission of sins; then the commencement of regeneration, that is, the mortification of our nature, is *expressed* either by immersion in water, or by the sprinkling of it. But lastly, when we presently rise up from the water, which we go under for a moment, the new life, which is the other part and the end of our regeneration, *is represented.*

Upon these words his Lordship grounds this remark. "It is *impossible not to see* in these words an exhibition of the same truth as is expressed in the 27th Article,—Signum regenerationis, per quod, tanquam per instrumentum, &c."* Meaning, of course, "the same truth" as he has *affirmed* this Article to express. A more remarkable proof of his Lordship's misinterpretation both of the one and the other could not have been afforded us. For the very words upon which he rests his statement are, as we see, borrowed from Calvin.

But, to have a just view of the testimony of this Catechism on the subject of baptism, we must proceed to that part which his Lordship has *not* quoted. The Catechism proceeds thus.

Nowell's Catechism.	Calvin's Catechism.
M. Non ergo remissionem peccatorum externa aquæ lavatione aut aspersione consequimur?	M. Num aquam esse animæ lavacrum censes?
A. Minime: nam solus Christus sanguine suo animarum nostrarum maculas luit atque eluit. Hunc ergo honorem externo elemento tribuere nefas est. Verum Spiritus Sanctus conscientias nostras sacro illo sanguine quasi aspergens, abstersis omnibus peccati sordibus, puros nos coram Deo reddit. Hujus vero peccatorum nostrorum expiationis *obsignationem atque pignus* in Sacramento habemus.	P. Nequaquam. Hunc enim honorem eripere Christi sanguini nefas est, qui ideo effusus fuit, ut abstersis omnibus nostris maculis, puros coram Deo et impollutos nos redderet. Atque hujus quidem purgationis fructum percipimus, quum sacro illo sanguine conscientias nostras Spiritus Sanctus aspergit: *obsignationem verò in Sacramento habemus.*
M. Regenerationem vero unde habemus?	M. Regeneratio autem unde?
A. Non aliunde quam a morte et resurrectione Christi; nam per mortis suæ vim vetus homo noster quodammodo crucifigitur et mortificatur, et naturæ nostræ vitiositas quasi sepelitur, ne amplius in nobis vivat et vigeat: resurrectionis vero suæ beneficio nobis largitur, ut in novam vitam ad obediendum Dei justitiæ reformemur.	P. A morte Christi et resurrectione simul. Hæc enim vis subest ejus morti, ut per eam crucifigatur vetus homo noster, et naturæ nostræ vitiositas quodammodo sepeliatur, ne amplius vigeat in nobis. Quod autem reformamur in novam vitam ad obediendum Dei justitiæ, id est resurrectionis beneficium.

"M. Thou seemest to make the water only a certain image of divine things.

"A. It is indeed an image, but by no means one that is empty or fallacious, inasmuch as the truth of the things themselves is joined and annexed to it. For as God truly offers to us in Baptism pardon of sins and newness of life, so are they certainly received by us. For let us not suppose that God mocks and deceives us with vain images."

* Charge, 3d ed, p. 15.

NOWELL'S CATECHISM.

M. *An gratiam hanc omnes communiter et promiscue consequuntur?*

A. *Soli fideles hunc fructum percipiunt: incredduli vero oblatas illic a Deo promissiones respuendo, aditum sibi præcludentes, inanes abeunt, non tamen ideo efficiunt, ut suam Sacramenta vim et naturam amittant.*

M. Rectus ergo baptismi usus quibus in rebus sit situs, breviter edissere.

A. In fide et pœnitentia. Primum enim Christi nos sanguine a cunctis purgatos sordibus Deo gratos esse, Spiritumque ejus in nobis habitare. *certa fiducia cum animis nostris statutum habere oportet.* Deinde in carne nostra mortificanda, obediendoque justitiæ Divinæ, assidue omni ope et opera est enitendum, et pia vita apud omnes declarandum nos in baptismo Christum ipsum quasi induisse, et ejus Spiritu donatos esse.

M. Quum infantes hæc, quæ commemoras, hactenus per ætatem præstare non possint, qui fit ut illi baptizentur?

A. Ut fides et pœnitentia baptismum præcedant, tantùm in adultis, qui per ætatem sunt utriusque capaces, exigitur: infantibus vero promissio ecclesiæ facta per Christum, in cujus fide baptizantur, in præsens satis erit, deinde postquam adoleverint, baptismi sui veritatem ipsos agnoscere, ejusque vim in animis eorum vigere, atque ipsorum vita et moribus repræsentari omnino oportet.

[Shewing here, like Calvin, that baptism has "eadem causa et ratio" with circumcision, he thus proceeds: –]

CALVIN'S CATECHISM.

M. *An promiscue in omnibus impletur hæc gratia?*

P. *Multi, dum illi sua pravitate viam præcludunt, efficiunt ut sibi sit inanis. Ita non nisi ad fideles solos pervenit fructus. Verùm, inde nihil Sacramenti naturæ decedit.*

[The last question and answer precede in the Catechism those which, for the purpose of comparison with Nowell's, I have placed before them.]

M. Quomodo per Baptismum nobis hæc bona conferuntur?

P. Quia, nisi promissiones illic nobis oblatas respuendo infructuosas reddimus, vestimur Christo, ejusque Spiritu donamur.

M. Nobis vero quid agendum est ut rite Baptismo utamur?

P. Rectus baptismi usus in fide et pœnitentia situs est: hoc est, ut statuamus primùm certa animi fiducia, nos ab omnibus maculis, Christi sanguine, purgatos, Deo placere: deinde ut Spiritum ejus sentiamus ipsi in nobis habitare: atque id operibus apud alios declaremus: utque assiduè nos in meditanda tum carnis mortificatione, tum justitiæ Dei obedientia, exerceamus.

M. Si hæc requiruntur ad legitimum Baptismi usum, qui fit ut infantes baptizemus?

P. Non est necesse ut Baptismum semper fides et pœnitentia præcedant: sed ab iis tantùm exiguntur qui per ætatem jam sunt utriusque capaces. Satis ergo fuerit, si infantes, postquam adoleverint, Baptismi sui vim exerant.

Nowell's Catechism.	Calvin's Catechism.
M. Perge adhuc.	* * * *
A. *Cum infantes nostros vim et quasi substantiam baptismi communem nobiscum habere certum sit, illis injuria fieret, si signum, quod veritate est inferius, ipsis negaretur:* eoque, quod ad testandam Dei misericordiam, confirmandasque ejus promissiones plurimum valet, sublato, eximia consolatione, qua veteres fruebantur, Christiani fraudarentur; duriusque cum nostris parvulis in Novo Testamento sub Christo ageretur, quam in veteri cum Judæorum infantibus sub Mose actum fuerat. Itaque quissimum est parvulis nostris Divinæ gratiæ atque salutis fidelium semini promissæ hæredes se esse, baptismo, *impresso quasi sigillo,* testatum fiat.	P. *Quum satis constet vim substantiamque (ut ita loquar) Baptismi infantibus esse communem, si illis negaretur signum, quod veritate est inferius, aperta illis injuria fieret.* [He had previously observed, Signo sublato (quod ad testandam Dei misericordiam et confirmandas promissiones plurimum valet) deesset nobis eximia consolatio, qua fruebantur veteres.]
M. Ecquid est amplius, quod de hac re velis dicere?	M. Qua ergo conditione baptizandi sunt infantes?
A. Quum Christus Dominus infantes ad se vocet, edicat etiam ne quis eos accessu prohibeat, ad se venientes amplectatur, ad eos regnum cœleste pertinere testetur, quos cœlesti palatio Deus dignatur, eos ab hominibus primo aditu vestibuloque prohiberi, et a Christiana Republica quodam modo excludi, summa videtur esse iniquitas.*	P. Ut testatum fiat, benedictionis fidelium semini promissæ ipsos esse hæredes: ut agnita, postquam adoleverint, Baptismi sui veritate, fructum ex eo percipiant ac proferant. (Calv. Catech., Op. Amst. 1667 et s. vol. viii. pp. 25, 26.)

* "M. Do we not therefore obtain remission of sins by external washing, or sprinkling of water?

"A. By no means: for Christ alone washes and cleanses away the spots of our souls by his own blood. Therefore it is wicked to give this honour to the external element. But the Holy Spirit, sprinkling as it were our consciences with that sacred blood, having wiped away all the defilement of sin, renders us pure before God. But of this expiation of our sins we have in the Sacrament *a seal and pledge.*

"M. But whence have we regeneration?

"A. From no other source than from the death and resurrection of Christ; for through the power of his death our old man is in a manner crucified and mortified, and the corruptness of our nature is as it were buried, that it may no longer live and flourish in us: but the blessed effect of his resurrection is to obtain for us, that we may be formed anew to a new life to obey the righteousness of God.

"M. *Do all universally and without distinction obtain this grace?*

"A. *The faithful only partake of this fruit: but the unbelieving by rejecting the promises there offered them by God, shutting the door of entrance against themselves, go away empty; yet they do not thereby cause the sacraments to lose their power and nature.*

From these passages, then, taken (as they must be) together, the doctrine of Nowell's Catechism, and consequently of the Church of England, on this point is abundantly clear. In fact it is obvious, that the very *expressions* in which the doctrine is enunciated, in all its leading features, are taken from Calvin.

It tells us distinctly that the promised grace pertaining to baptism is received only by the faithful; and that the reason why our infants are baptized is, that they *have* the *power*, and, as it were, the *substance* of baptism, and *therefore* that it would be

---

"M. Explain then in a few words in what things the right use of baptism consists.

"A. In faith and repentance. For first, *we ought to have our minds convinced with an unwavering confidence* that we, being cleansed from all defilements by the blood of Christ, are acceptable to God, and that his Spirit dwells in us. Then we must labour assiduously with all our power and efforts in the mortification of our flesh, and in obeying the righteousness of God; and by a life of piety it is to be manifested before all that in baptism we have as it were put on Christ, and have the gift of his Spirit.

"M. Since infants are not as yet able, on account of their age, to perform those things which thou hast mentioned, how is it that they are baptized?

"A. That faith and repentance should precede baptism, is required only in adults who are of an age to be capable of them: but for infants the promise made to the Church through Christ in whose faith they are baptized, will be for the present sufficient; then, after they have grown up, duty requires that they themselves should acknowledge the truth of their baptism, and that its power should flourish in their souls, and be set forth in their life and conduct.

[Showing here, like Calvin, that baptism has "the same reason and design" with circumcision, he thus proceeds:—]

"M. Go on.

"A. *Since it is certain that our infants have the power, and as it were the substance, of baptism in common with us, it would be an injustice done them, if the sign, which is inferior to the truth, should be denied them*, and if that were taken away, which has much force for bearing witness to the mercy of God and confirming his promises, Christians would be deprived of an excellent ground of comfort which the ancients enjoyed; and our infants would be dealt with more hardly in the New Testament under Christ, than were the infants of the Jews in the Old Testament under Moses. Therefore it is most just that testimony should be borne to our little ones by baptism, *as by the impress of a seal*, that they are heirs of Divine grace, and of the salvation promised to the seed of the faithful.

"M. Is there anything more which thou desirest to say on this matter?

"A. Since Christ the Lord calls infants to him, commandeth also that no man forbid them access, embraces those that come to him, testifies that the kingdom of heaven belongs to them, it seems to be a very great sin that those whom God vouchsafes to receive in the heavenly palace should be prohibited by man from the first entrance and porch, and be in a certain manner shut out of the Christian Commonwealth."

wronging them to deny them *the sign*, which is inferior to the reality which they possess: the very words of Calvin.* And by the explanation here given of the nature and effects of baptism, we must interpret the words which occur in the first answer given on the subject of baptism.

"M. Quot in Ecclesia sua Sacramenta instituit Dominus?

"A. Duo.

"M. Quæ?

"A. Baptismum et sacram cœnam: quorum communis est inter omnes fideles usus. Altero enim *renascimur*, altero sustentamur ad vitam æternam."†

We are regenerated by baptism, inasmuch as baptism is the sign and seal of our new birth (and Sacraments are called by the names of the things they represent); inasmuch also as, if we are accepted in the sight of God, (a necessary pre-requisite to the operation of *God in his Sacraments*,) we are thereby *formally* and *publicly* incorporated into the true Church of Christ, and receive regenerating grace. To use the words of Peter Lombard himself, above quoted, "We were within *before* in the judgment of God, but *now* we are also within in the judgment of the Church" ("Ante intus eramus judicio Dei, sed nunc etiam judicio Ecclesiæ"). And the Church *now* (and not before) can say, in the judgment of faith and charity (the only judgment which the Church is entitled to pass), that we are regenerate. And we are then regenerated, inasmuch as the work of regeneration is then *perfected*, in the same sense and way as a covenant

---

* Had the Bishop of Exeter read these words, when in his recent Charge he referred to the words of the "Directory for Public Worship," in 1644,—that children "are Christians, and federally holy before baptism, and *therefore* they are *baptized*,"—as shewing that his opponents agree with the doctrine of the Dissenters *in opposition* to that of the Church of England? (Charge, p. 12.) His Lordship might as well have charged them with opposition to the Doctrine of the Church of England, because they agree with Dissenters in holding the doctrine of the Trinity. On which side is the dissent from the doctrine of the Church of England, Nowell's Catechism very clearly shews.

† "M. How many Sacraments has God ordained in his Church?

"A. Two.

"M. What are they?

"A. Baptism and the Holy Supper: the use of which is universal among all the faithful. For by the one we are born again, by the other we are nourished to eternal life."

is perfected by affixing to it the seal. *In fact, as we have already seen* (p. 155 above), *the very same words are used in the Genevan Annotations on the New Testament.*

And when the Catechism comes to explain, in the very next answer, the nature of baptism, it again adopts the expressions of Calvin.

Nowell.	Calvin.
M. De baptismo ergo primum dic quid censeas.	
A. Quum natura filii iræ, id est, alieni ab ecclesia, quæ Dei familia est, simus, baptismus veluti aditus quidam nobis est, per quem in eam admittimur: unde et testimonium etiam amplissimum accipimus, in numero domesticorum adeoque filiorum Dei, nos jam esse: imo in Christi corpus quasi cooptari atque inseri, ejusque membra fieri, et in unum cum ipso corpus coalescere.*	P. Baptismus veluti quidam in Ecclesiam aditus nobis est. Illic enim testimonium habemus, nos quum alioqui extranei alienique simus, in Dei familiam recipi, ut inter ejus domesticos censeamur. (Catech.) Si eorum [infantium] est regnum cœlorum, cur signum negabitur, quo velut aditus aperitur in Ecclesiam, ut in eam cooptati, hæredes regni cœlestis adscribantur. (Inst iv. c. 16, § 17.)

In baptism, as Nowell says, regeneration "effigiem suam tenet," or in the corresponding words of Calvin, "Spiritualis regeneratio figuratur;"† but, as both say, it is a figure or representation of *such* a kind, "ut annexa sit veritas;" because God does not deal with *his servants* by empty signs. No; wherever the party is such as he accepts, (for whom alone Sacraments were ordained at all,) God works with his Sacraments, and they not merely seal, but give grace. But to argue from this that God is bound to work with his Sacraments upon the hearts of all to whom man chooses to give them, even in the case of infants, is the extreme of presumption.

I will only add, that the general definition of a Sacrament given in this Catechism is also precisely that of Calvin.

---

* "M. Say therefore first what thou thinkest of Baptism.

"A. Since we are by nature children of wrath, that is, aliens from the Church, which is the family of God, Baptism is as it were a certain door of entrance to us, by which we are admitted into it: whence also we receive a most decisive testimony that we are now in the number of the household, and thus of the sons of God; yea, that we are as it were admitted and ingrafted into the body of Christ, and are become his members, and are united into one body with him."

† So in his "Institutions," he says, that the "res figurata" in baptism is 'regeneratio." (Inst. iv. c. 16. § 4. See also §§ 17, 20, and 21.)

Nowell.	Calvin.
M. . . . Quid est Sacramentum?	M. Quid est Sacramentum?
A. Est externa Divinæ erga nos per Christum benevolentiæ beneficentiæque testificatio, signo aspectabili arcanam spiritualemque gratiam repræsentans, qua Dei promissiones de remissione peccatorum, et æterna salute per Christum data, quasi consignantur, et earum veritas in cordibus nostris certius confirmatur.*	P. Externa Divinæ erga nos benevolentiæ testificatio, quæ visibili signo spirituales gratias figurat, ad obsignandas cordibus nostris Dei promissiones, quò earum veritas melius confirmetur.

BULLINGER'S DECADS.

Another book which received the sanction of public authority in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was Bullinger's Decads, which, as I have already shown,† was then considered so valuable an exponent of the doctrine of our Church, that "the Archbishop and Bishops" assembled in Convocation in 1586, issued an order that the junior ministers should provide themselves with "a Bible and Bullinger's Decads in Latin or English," and read one chapter in the Bible every day and one sermon in the Decads every week, making notes on them in a paper-book to be shown at stated times to a person appointed to examine them, who was to report to the Bishop the way in which these exercises were performed. A more emphatic sanction to a work it would be impossible to conceive. I do not of course mean to assert, that we are bound to receive every thing that is said in this work as the established doctrine of the Church of England; but it can hardly be denied, that its *general views* of doctrine must have been considered as agreeable to those of our Church by the Prelates who thus adopted it for the instruction of young divines among us.

What, then, is the testimony of this work on the doctrine of

---

* "M. . . . What is a Sacrament?

"A. It is an external testification of the Divine benevolence and beneficence towards us through Christ, representing by a visible sign a secret and spiritual grace, by which the promises of God of the remission of sins and eternal salvation given through Christ are as it were sealed, and the truth of them is more certainly confirmed in our hearts."

† See p. 97, above.

the effects of baptism? The following extracts will, I think, be amply sufficient to answer this question.*

His whole system of doctrine may at once be judged of from the way in which he speaks of the doctrine of Predestination.

"The predestination of God," he says, "is the eternal decree of God, whereby he hath ordained, either to save or destroy men, a most certain end of life and death being appointed unto them." ——"God, by his eternal and unchangeable counsel, hath foreappointed, who are to be saved, and who are to be condemned.... God hath ordained and decreed to save all how many so ever have communion and fellowship with Christ his only begotten son: and to destroy or condemn all, how many so ever have no part in the communion or fellowship of Christ his only son. Now *the faithful verily have fellowship with Christ, and the unfaithful are strangers from Christ*. For Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, saith, 'God hath chosen us in Christ before the foundations of the world were laid,' &c. (Eph. i) Lo, God hath chosen us, and he hath chosen us before the foundations of the world were laid, yea, he hath chosen us, 'that we should be without blame,' that is, to be heirs of eternal life: howbeit, 'in Christ,' by and through Christ hath he chosen us. And yet again more plainer: 'he hath predestinate us,' saith he, 'to adopt us into his sons,' but by Christ, *and that too hath he done freely, to the intent that to his divine grace glory might be given. Therefore whosoever are in Christ, are chosen and elected*.... They are wrong that think those that are to be saved to life, are predestinate of God for the merit's sake or good works which God did foresee in them. For notably saith the Apostle Paul, 'He hath chosen us in Christ, into himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, that the glory of his grace might be praised.' And again, 'It is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth mercy.' (Rom. ix.)"——"First of all, verily, true faith is required in the elect. For the elect are called, and being called, they receive their calling by faith.... Furthermore, *unless we be drawn of the heavenly Father, we cannot believe*." (pp. 642—645.)

And his definition of "regeneration" is this,—

"Let us now against this [*i. e.* "the old man"] oppose or set the new man, that is, the man which is regenerate by the Spirit of God, *through the faith of Jesus Christ*. Now regeneration is the renew-

* The English translation being sanctioned by the Bishops in the above "Order," I have, for the convenience of the general reader, quoted from it instead of the Latin original. The edition I have used is that of Lond. 1577. 4to.

ing of the man, by which, *through the faith of Jesus Christ*, we which were the sons of Adam, and of wrath, are born again the sons of God, and do therefore put off the old man, and put on the new, which both in understanding and will doth freely serve the Lord. This regeneration is the renewing of the mind, not of the body: as we heard in another place out of the third chapter of St. John's Gospel. The author of this regeneration is the Holy Ghost, which is from heaven given unto man, *I mean to a faithful man*. For the gift of the Holy Ghost is given for Christ his sake, and that too, *unto none but those that do believe in Christ*. . . . . And in this regeneration of man, the will also doth receive an heavenly virtue, to do the good which the understanding perceived by the Holy Ghost, so that it willeth, chooseth, and worketh the good that the Lord hath shewed it: and on the other side nilleth, hateth, and repelleth the evil that the Lord hath forbidden it." (p. 590.)

The following is his definition of a Sacrament:—

"Sacraments are holy actions consisting of words or promises of the Gospel, or of prescript rites or ceremonies, given for this end to the Church of God from heaven, to be witnesses and seals of the preaching of the Gospel, to exercise and try faith, and by earthly and visible things to represent and set before our eyes the deep mysteries of God, to be short, to gather together a visible Church or congregation, and to admonish them of their duty." (p. 959.)

Stating in what Sacraments consist, he says,—

"Now let us see in what things Sacraments consist. By the testimony of the Scripture, and of all the godly men, they consist in two things, to wit, in the sign and the thing signified, in the word and the rite, in the promise of the Gospel, and in the ceremony, in the outward thing and the inward, in the earthly thing (I say) and the heavenly. . . . In baptism, water, or sprinkling of water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and all that which is done of the Church is a sign, rite, ceremony, and outward thing, earthly and sensible, lying open, and made plain to the senses: but remission of sins, partaking of (everlasting) life, fellowship with Christ and his members, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, which are given unto us by the grace of God *through faith in Christ Jesus*, is the thing signified, the inward and heavenly thing, and that intelligible thing, which is *not perceived but by a faithful mind*." (pp. 968, 969.)

How the Sacraments are sanctified,—

"There are some which think there is such force grafted of God

into the words, that if they be pronounced over the signs, they sanctify, change, and in a manner bring with them, or make present the things signified, and plant or include them within the signs, *or at the least join them with the signs.* For hereupon are these kind of speeches heard, That the water of Baptism by the virtue of the words doth regenerate."

And then proceeding to refute this notion, he adds,—

"Therefore by the nature, will, deed, and commandment of God, and not by the pronunciation of any words, are the Sacraments sanctified. *To which will of God, that it may be applied unto man, and do him good, the faithful obedience of men is necessarily required.*" (pp. 971, 972.)

Separability of the sign and the thing signified,—

"Many be partakers of the sign, and yet are barred from the thing signified." (p. 981.)

"Many receive the visible sacraments, and yet are not partakers of the invisible grace, which BY FAITH ONLY IS RECEIVED." (p. 983.)

Of the Sacramental union;—

"Albeit either of the parts [of a Sacrament, the sign, and the thing signified] without mixture do retain their own nature, yet those two agree in one sacrament, and being joined together and not divided, do make one perfect and lawful sacrament . . . But here some move many and divers questions touching the sacramental union, whether it be personal, real, or rational. I, because I see nothing of this matter doubtfully delivered of the Apostles, and that the thing being plain of itself by such manner of sophistications is made dark, doubtful, difficult and obscure, simply and plainly say, that the sign and the thing signified are joined together in the sacraments by God's institution: *by faithful contemplation and use:* to be short, in signification and likeness of the things: but I utterly deny that those two are naturally united together, so that the sign in the sacrament beginneth to be that which the thing signified is in his own substance and nature: I deny that the thing signified is joined corporally with the sign, so that the sign remaineth still in his own substance and nature, and yet nevertheless in the mean time hath the thing signified corporally joined unto it, *that thereby whosoever is partaker of the sign, should be also by the sign or with the sign partaker of the thing itself* . . . Furthermore, I say that the sign and the thing signified are coupled together by God's institution, because he which instituted the Sacrament of Baptism and the

Supper, instituted it not to this end, that with water we might wash away the filth of the body, as the custom is to do by daily use of baths, neither that we should take our fill of the bread and wine, but that under visible signs he might commend unto us the mysteries of our redemption and his grace, and to be short, of our salvation, by representing them to renew them, and by sealing them to confirm them. My saying is, that they are coupled together *in a faithful contemplation*, because *they which partake the Sacraments religiously*, do not fasten their eyes on sensible things only, but rather on things insensible, signified and heavenly, so that THE FAITHFUL *have in themselves both twain coupled together, which otherwise in the sign or with the sign are knit together with no bond.* For corporally and sensibly they receive the signs, but spiritually they possess, comprehend, renew, and exercise the things signified. In *signification and likeness* of the things, I say, they are coupled together, because the sign is a token of the thing signified. . . . Moreover, in respect of the likeness of the sign and the thing signified, *the name of the one is given to the other,* as I will prove by most evident testimonies of Scripture."

And then having referred to Gen. xvii. where circumcision is called the Covenant, and Exod. xii. where the Lamb is called the Passover, &c., for the Old Testament, he thus proceeds,—

"Now we are come also to the Sacraments of the New Testament, whose signs also bear the names of the things signified. For Peter saith, Acts ii., 'Let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesu Christ for the remission of sins.' And Paul also in the Acts of the Apostles heareth, 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins by calling on the name of the Lord.' Therefore truly baptism is called a cleansing, or washing away of sins. And Peter also elsewhere saith, 'Baptism saveth you, not that thereby the filth of the flesh is put away, but in that a good conscience maketh request unto God.' And Paul also saith, (1 Cor. vi.) 'Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God.' Therefore the due and right comparing of these places between themselves doth manifestly prove, that to the sign of baptism, which is water, is given the name of the thing signified." (pp. 986—989.)

Here we see that these passages of Scripture are explained, not by supposing them to mean that the inward grace always accompanies the outward sign, but from the name of the thing signified being given to the sign.

On this latter point he further remarks,—

"That we may yet at length make an end of this place, they are sacramental and figurative speeches, when we read and hear that the bread is the body of Christ. . . . also *that they are purged from their sins and regenerated into a new life which are baptized in the name of Christ, and that baptism is the washing away of all our sins.* And after this manner speaketh the Scripture, and this form of speech kept the old doctors of the Church, whom for so doing none that is wise doth dispraise, neither can one discommend any man which speaketh after this manner, so that he also abide in the same sincerity wherein it is manifest that those holy men of God did walk. For as they did willingly and simply use those speeches, so did they not roughly and rigorously strain the letter and speeches; they did interpret them in such sort, that none was so unskilful, but that he might understand that the signs were not the thing itself which they signified, but that the signs do take the names of the things, therefore they used words *significatively, sacramentally, mystically, and figuratively.*" (p. 993.)

The Sacraments do not confer grace of themselves,—

"To confer grace, what is it else than to give, or frankly and freely to bestow something on a man which he had not before. Therefore if the Sacraments do give grace to the receivers of them, then truly they give those things which they signify, to them which had them not, I mean, Christ with all his gifts, that is to say, they make them pleasant and acceptable unto God, they justify and save, yea, and that of themselves, insomuch as they are said to have received virtue to sanctify from the passion of Christ, and not signify only or to help, to commend or to further. Yea, and they also attribute the receiving of grace to our work, whereby we receive the Sacrament. But how contrary this doctrine is to the truth of the holy prophets and apostles, will now declare." . . . "The Lord did not institute Sacraments or Sacrifices, that being offered they might give grace, or justify us, but to be witnesses of the grace of God, and that by them his people might be kept and drawn in due order, &c." (pp. 1000, 1001.)

The thing signified is received only through faith. (This has been already stated in a passage quoted above):—

"In Baptism and the Lord's Supper we practise no other faith than whereby we believe, that we are purged from our sins by the grace and mercy of Christ, and that by his body given for us, and his blood shed for us, we are redeemed from death, and become heirs of eternal life. *Not* the Sacraments, but faith through the Holy Ghost applieth these things unto us; which thing all the writings of the Apostles do witness." (p. 1002.)

Maintaining that "*the godly are first justified and received into favour before they be made partakers of the Sacraments,*" he says,—

"*The holy and elect people of God are not then first of all partakers of the first grace of God, and heavenly gifts, when they receive the Sacraments. For they enjoy the things before they be partakers of the signs.* For it is plainly declared unto us, that Abraham our father was justified before he was circumcised. And who gathereth [not]* thereby, that justification was not exhibited and given unto him by the sacrament of circumcision; but rather that that righteousness which he by faith before possessed, was by the sacrament sealed and confirmed unto him? And moreover who will not thereof gather, that we which are the sons of Abraham are after no other manner justified, than it appeareth that our father was justified, and that our Sacraments work no further in us than they did in him? especially since the nature of the Sacraments of the people of the Old Testament and ours is all one."

And he then proceeds to confirm this by the cases of the Ethiopian eunuch, Cornelius, &c. (pp. 1006, 1007.)

THE SAME, HE TELLS US, IS TRUE IN THE CASE OF INFANTS:—

"Forasmuch therefore as Cornelius with his household received the Holy Ghost before they were baptised, it is manifest that he did not obtain the Holy Ghost as given first by baptism or with baptism. Again, we read in the Acts of the Apostles, 'They that gladly received the word of Peter were baptised.' Therefore before they were baptised of Peter, they had obtained the grace of God through faith. FOR WHY, I PRAY YOU, DO WE BAPTISE OUR INFANTS? *Is it because they believe with their heart, and confess with their mouth? I think not. Do we not therefore baptise them, because God hath commanded them to be brought unto him? because he hath promised that he will be our God, and the God of our seed after us? To be short,* BECAUSE WE BELIEVE THAT GOD OF HIS MERE GRACE AND MERCY, IN THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST, HATH CLEANSED AND ADOPTED THEM, AND APPOINTED THEM TO BE HEIRS OF ETERNAL LIFE? *We therefore baptising infants for these causes, do abundantly testify, that there is not first given unto them in baptism, but that there is sealed and confirmed which they had before.*" (p. 1007.)

Reply to those who object that the Sacraments are thus deprived of their efficacy:—

* The original is, "Inde vero quis non colligat."

"They object, I know well enough, against these things . . . that we do evacuate and make of none effect the Sacraments, and that we teach that the faithful receive in them or by them nothing but bare water, and bare bread and wine; and that by that means God by us is accused of falsehood and lying. We briefly answer, If they set void or empty things (as I may so say) against full things, so as they be void or empty, which have not the things themselves included in them, truly I had rather confess them to be void than full. But if they call them void or empty, and mean profane or unholy things, that is to say, which differ nothing from profane signs; if by bare, they understand things of no force; we openly profess that we have Sacraments which are holy, and not profane; effectual, and not without force; garnished from above, not naked; and therefore full, not void or empty. For they are holy things and not profane, because they are instituted of God, and for godly men, not for profane persons. *They are effectual, and not without force;* FOR IN THE CHURCH, WITH THE GODLY AND FAITHFUL, THEY WORK THE SAME EFFECT AND END WHEREUNTO THEY WERE ORDAINED OF GOD. Whereof more hereafter. They are also worthily said to be beautified and adorned by God, and not bare things; which have the word [of]* God itself, wherewith they are most beautifully adorned. And therefore also they are full, and not empty Sacraments, because they have those things which make a perfect Sacrament." (p. 1008.)

How far, and in what way, the Sacraments are efficacious:—

"He instituted Sacraments to be testimonies of his grace, and seals of the truth of his promises. . . . Therefore as God is true, and cannot lie, so the seals of his promises are most true. He hath promised that he will be ours, and that in Christ he will communicate himself unto us with all his gifts. He therefore of a certainty sheweth himself such an one, and doth communicate himself unto us: *although he do it not now first of all when we receive the Sacraments.* . . . As soon as we first believed, he began to shew himself such an one unto us, and doth shew himself more and more through the whole course of our life: we receive him, and comprehend him spiritually and by faith. Therefore *when we are partakers of the Sacraments, he proceedeth to communicate himself unto us after a special manner, that is to say, proper unto Sacraments, and so we, which before were made partakers of Christ, do continue and strengthen that communion or fellowship spiritually and by faith, in the celebration of the Sacraments, outwardly sealing the same unto ourselves by the signs.*" (p. 1009.)

* The original is, "ipsum Dei verbum."

"The chief end of Sacraments is this, that they are testimonies to confirm the truth, by which the Lord in his Church even visibly doth testify that the things now uttered by preaching of the Gospel, and by the promises assured to the faithful from the beginning of the world, are in every point so brought to pass, and are so certainly true, as they are declared and promised in the word of truth." (p. 1010.)

"The bountiful and gracious Lord of his mere mercy receiveth mankind into the partaking of all his good gifts and graces, and adopteth *the faithful*, that now they be not only joined in league with God, but also the children of God, which thing by the holy action of baptism, being instead of the sign, or the very sign itself, is most evidently by representation laid before the eyes of all men. For the minister of God standeth at the holy font to whom the infant is offered to be baptized, whom he receiveth and baptizeth into the name, or in the name, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For we may find both, 'Into the name,' and 'In the name.' So that to be baptized 'Into the name of the Lord,' is to be sealed into his virtue and power (for the name of the Lord signifieth power), into the favour, mercy, and protection of God, yea, to be graffed, and as it were to be fastened, to be dedicated, and to be incorporated into God. To be baptized 'in the name of the Lord,' is by the commandment or authority of God to be baptized, I mean by the commission or appointment of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be received into the company of the children of God, and to be counted of God's household, that they which are baptized are [for *are* read *may be*]* and be called Christians, and be named with the name of God, being called the children of God the Father, &c. His speech therefore doth somewhat resemble that which we read elsewhere, that 'The name of God was called upon, over some one;' which is in a manner as if we should say, that one is called by the name of God, that is, to be called, 'The servant and son of God.' THEY THEREFORE WHICH BEFORE BY GRACE INVISIBLY ARE RECEIVED OF GOD INTO THE SOCIETY OF GOD, THOSE SELFSAME ARE VISIBLY NOW BY BAPTISM ADMITTED INTO THE SELFSAME HOUSEHOLD OF GOD BY THE MINISTER OF GOD, and therefore at that time also receive their name, that they may always remember, that in baptism they gave up their names to Christ, and in like manner also received a name. After this manner, by a most apt analogy, the very sign resembleth the thing signified. To be short, baptism is done by water. And water in men's mat-

* The original is, "ut baptizati sint et dicantur Christiani."

ters hath a double use. For it cleanseth filth, and as it were reneweth man: also it quencheth thirst, and cooleth him that is in a heat. So also it representeth the grace of God, when it cleanseth *his faithful ones* from their sins, regenerateth and refresheth us with his Spirit. Beside this, the minister of Christ sprinkleth or rather poureth in water, or being dipped taketh them out of the water: whereby is signified that God very bountifully bestoweth his gifts *upon his faithful ones*: it signifieth also that we are buried with Christ into his death, and are raised again with him into newness of life. Pharao was drowned in the gulf of the Red Sea, but the people of God passed through it safe. For our old Adam must be drowned and extinguished; but our new Adam day by day must be quickened and rise up again (out of the water). Therefore is the mortification and vivification of Christians very excellently represented by baptism." (p. 1018.)

"Sacraments therefore do visibly graff us into the fellowship of Christ and his saints, *who were invisibly graffed by his grace before we were partakers of the Sacraments*: but by receiving of the Sacraments, we do now open and make manifest, of whose body we would be and are members; the Lord with his signs or marks by his minister also visibly marking us for his own household and for his own people." (p. 1021.)

"*We are not first graffed into the body of Christ* (as we have often repeated already) *by partaking of the Sacraments: but we which were before ingraffed by grace invisibly are now also visibly consecrated.*" (p. 1023.)

Previous grace is necessary that the Sacraments may be of any avail:—

"If the inward anointing and sealing of the Holy Ghost be wanting, the outward action will be counted but a toy to the unbelievers, neither worketh the sealing of the Sacraments anything at all: but when faith, the gift of the Holy Ghost, goeth before, the sealing of the Sacraments is very strong and sure. Some also have said very well, If our minds be destitute of the Holy Ghost, the Sacraments do no more profit us, than it doth a blind man to look upon the bright beams of the sun." (pp. 1016, 1017.)

"In them that believe not, the signs remain as they are without life: therefore these things [he had been speaking of the consolations of religion] are brought to pass by the virtue or power of faith, and of the Spirit working in the lawful use of the Sacraments: without faith and the Holy Ghost they are not felt or perceived." (p. 1020.)

"That sacraments without faith profit not, it is easily proved. For

it is said that sacraments are seals of the preaching of the Gospel, and things appertaining to the same. For if the preaching of the Gospel be heard without faith, it doth not only profit nothing unto life, but it turneth rather unto judgment (to him that heareth)."

And then, having quoted several passages in proof of this, he adds,—"Therefore without faith Sacraments profit nothing." (p. 1026.)

Proceeding from this discussion on the nature of the Sacraments in general, to treat of baptism in particular, he thus defines baptism :—

"We describing the nature of baptism more at large do say, That it is an holy action instituted of God, and consisting of the word of God, and the holy rite or ceremony, whereby the people of God are dipped in the water in the name of the Lord : to be short, whereby the Lord himself doth represent and seal unto us our purifying or cleansing, gathereth us into one body, and putteth the baptized in mind of their duty." (p. 1033.)

Here again he repeats, that Sacraments are not to be considered as bestowing the first gifts of grace, remarking :—

"As we deny not, that we are graffed into the body of Christ, by partaking of the Sacraments, (as we declared in our last sermon of Sacraments, next and immediately going before this) so we have elsewhere shewed, and that too oftentimes already very largely, that the first beginning of our uniting or fellowship with Christ, is not wrought by the Sacraments : but that the same uniting or fellowship which was founded and grounded upon the promise, and by the grace of God through the Holy Ghost was communicated unto us *and ours*, yea before the use of the Sacraments, is continued and sealed unto us by the participation or receiving of the Sacraments. Although therefore an infant die without baptism, and being shut out by necessity from having fellowship with Christ, so that he be neither partaker nor yet sealed by the visible sign of the Covenant, yet he is not altogether an alien or stranger from Christ, to whom he is fastened with the spiritual knot of the covenant by the virtue whereof he is saved." (pp. 1047, 1048.)

And hence he grounds the title of infants to baptism partly on the fact that the Holy Spirit is given to infants, and that consequently such have a right to baptism :—

"St. Peter," he says, "could not deny them the baptism of water,

to whom he saw the Holy Ghost to be given, which is an assured token of God's people. . . . Wherefore the holy apostle Peter denied not baptism to infants. For he knew assuredly, even by the doctrine of his Lord and Master (*that I may speak nothing now of the everlasting covenant of God*) that the kingdom of heaven is of infants. No man is received into the kingdom, unless he be the friend of God. And these are not destitute of the Spirit of God. 'For he which hath not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of his.' (Rom. viii.) Children are God's; therefore they have the Spirit of God. Therefore if they have received the Holy Ghost as well as we; if they be accounted among the people of God as well as we that be grown in age; who (I pray you) can forbid these to be baptized with water in the name of the Lord?" (pp. 1055, 1056.)

On the force and effect of baptism he writes thus,—

"The holy Scripture teacheth that we are washed clean from our sins by baptism. For baptism is a sign, a testimony and sealing of our cleansing. For God verily hath promised sanctification to his Church, and he for his truth's sake purifieth his Church from all sins by his grace, through the blood of his Son, and regenerateth and cleanseth it by his Spirit, which cleansing is *sealed in us by baptism* which we receive; *and thereof is it called in the Scriptures, cleansing and remission of sins, purifying, new birth, regeneration, and the laver or fountain of regeneration:* as circumcision is called the covenant: and sacrifices, sins and sanctifications." (p. 1060.)

"Wherefore the promise, yea the truth of sanctification and free remission of sins, is written and engraven in our bodies when we are baptized. For God by his Spirit, through the blood of his Son, hath newly regenerated and purged again our souls, and even now doth regenerate and purge them." (p. 1061.)

"Beside that, by baptism we are gathered together into the fellowship of the people of God. Whereupon of some it is called the first sign or entrance into Christianity, by the which an entrance into the Church lieth open unto us. *Not that before we did not belong to the Church. For whosoever is of Christ, partaker of the promises of God, and of his eternal covenant, belongeth unto the Church.* Baptism, therefore, is *a visible sign, and testimony of our ingraffing into the body of Christ.* And it is rightly called a planting, incorporating, or ingraffing into the body of Christ. For I said in the general discourse of Sacraments, that we first by baptism were joined with Christ [i. e. he means, publicly and formally], and afterward with all the members of Christ, our brethren. For Paul saith, 'All ye that are baptized have put on Christ.' But to put on Christ, is

to be made one with him, and as it were to be joined and incorporated in him, that he may live in us and we in him. For he only by his Spirit regenerateth and reneweth us," &c. (pp. 1061, 1062.)

But who they are in whom God works by his Sacraments he thus informs us,—

"The godly, yea even at this day, do receive baptism as it were at the hands of God himself, though they be baptized through the ministry of men. For the Lord establishing [or, giving effect to, *assistens*] his institutions by his Spirit, *worketh salvation* IN THE ELECT." (p. 1033.)

The importance of this work, from the public sanction which it obtained in our Church, will, I conceive, be considered as affording a very sufficient reason for these numerous extracts. And certainly their testimony is clear and decisive.

There are several other works of the foreign Reformers which, from the way in which they were received in this country, might also be fairly appealed to, and are entitled to some consideration in our present inquiry; particularly those mentioned in the Decree of the University of Oxford in 1579, given at p. 96, above. But I cannot but feel, that the domestic authorities I am about to produce are sufficiently abundant to render it quite unnecessary to seek for further evidence.

In proceeding to individual testimonies, I should have been glad to have carried the investigation first through the whole series of Archbishops and University Professors given in a former chapter. But, after careful research, I can find but the following among them who have left any direct testimony of their views on the subject of our present inquiry. Archbishops Whitgift and Sandys; Professors Abbot, Prideaux, Westfaling, Calfhill, and Benefield, (of whom the four former were also Bishops,) at Oxford; and Professors Whitaker and Davenant, (of whom the latter was also a Bishop,) at Cambridge. But their testimony is unanimous, and, for the most part, of the strongest and clearest kind, in our favour. And from the known *general* theological views of nearly all the rest (already pointed out*), there can be no doubt of their concurrence in the same doctrine.

* See pp. 98—111 above.

The divines just mentioned I shall place first in the catena of testimonies I am about to offer to the reader. And I would beg him to observe, that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Divinity Professors of the two Universities, are the sole *ex officio* clerical members of the new Court of Appeal, proposed in various Bills presented during the last few years to the Upper House of Parliament, for the trial of charges of heresy and false doctrine.

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT;

Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge 1566, 1567;—*Regius Professor of Divinity* 1567;—*Master of Trinity College* 1567 *to* 1577;—*Bishop of Worcester from* 1577 *to* 1583;—*Archbishop of Canterbury from* 1583 *to* 1604.

In 1572 Dr. Whitgift published an "Answer to a certain Libel, entitled an Admonition to the Parliament;" which having elicited a reply from Cartwright, he rejoined in 1574 in a "Defence" of the former work, in which the "Answer" is reprinted. I quote the following passages from the "Defence."*

And first I must remind the reader of the passage already quoted in a previous page,† in which he maintains that God's government by his Spirit, in the hearts and consciences of men, is "*in the Church of the elect only.*"‡

Further, he tells us, that it is known to God only who are members of the Church; which wholly and summarily excludes the view that all infants are made by baptism members of the true invisible Church of Christ. He says,—

"You must of necessity admit this distinction (some be *of the Church* and some be *only in the Church*), else can you not make any visible Church; for we only know, who be *in the Church;* but who be *of the Church* is known to him alone, who knoweth *those that be his.*"§

---

* Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, against the Reply of T. C. Lond. 1574. fol.

† See p. 99, above. ‡ p. 80. § p. 179.

But we find passages still more direct upon the subject. As for instance, the following,—

"You say, 'that we attribute to the sign that which is proper to the work of God in the blood of Christ, as though virtue were in water to wash away sin.' You know very well that we teach far otherwise, and that it is a certain and true doctrine of all such as profess the Gospel, that the outward signs of the Sacrament do not contain in them grace, NEITHER YET THAT THE GRACE OF GOD IS OF NECESSITY TIED UNTO THEM; but only that they be seals of God's promises, notes of Christianity, testimonies and effectual signs of the grace of God, and of our redemption in Christ Jesus, by the which the Spirit of God doth invisibly work in us, not only the *increase of faith*, but *confirmation* also. You understand likewise, that this difference there is betwixt these external elements, being selected to be Sacramental signs, (that is, betwixt water in baptism, and common water: bread and wine in the Eucharist, and usual bread and wine,) that these now be sacraments sanctified to another use, to a spiritual use, to the *nourishing of faith*, and feeding of the soul, to be instruments of the Holy Ghost, by the which as by instruments we be fed to eternal life. Furthermore, you cannot be ignorant, that whosoever contemneth these external signs, and refuseth them, cannot be a member of Christ, neither yet be saved. Last of all you have learned, that there is such a similitude betwixt the signs, and the thing signified, that they are not only in Scripture usually called by the names of those things whereof they be Sacraments (as bread the body of Christ, and water regeneration), but also that the contumely or contempt done to the one doth redound to the other, that is, the contempt of the signs is the contempt of the things signified; and therefore St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. ii., 'He that eateth,' &c. And Christ, John iii., 'Except a man be born,' &c. These things being considered, it is no superstitious toy, but a godly and true saying, that Christ hath sanctified all waters (used in baptizing) to the mystical washing away of sin: not ascribing or attributing washing away of sin to the external element, any otherwise than instrumentally, or IN ANY OTHER RESPECT THAN FOR THE SIMILITUDE THAT SACRAMENTS HAVE WITH THE THINGS WHEREOF THEY BE SACRAMENTS; *for we know that wicked men may receive these external signs, and yet remain the members of Satan.*"*

Here, while, like all orthodox theologians, he maintains that

* p. 738.

the Spirit of God works by the Sacraments, yet it is only where he pleases to do so, and for the increase and confirmation of previous gifts; "the grace of God is not of necessity tied unto them;" nor is the washing away of sin to be attributed to them "in any other respect than for the similitude that Sacraments have with the things whereof they be Sacraments."

And he held it to be quite uncertain what the state of the baptized is, *whether adult or infant,* as to membership in the true Church. For he says,—

"I make the Holy Sacrament of Baptism no other kind of passage than God himself hath made it, and the Church of Christ hath ever used it. Good and evil, clean and unclean, holy and profane, must needs pass by it, except you will in deed in more ample and large manner tie the grace of God unto it, than ever did the Papists, and say that all that be baptized be also saved; or else join with the Anabaptists in this, that after baptism a man cannot sin. *Who can tell, whether he be holy or unholy, good or evil, clean or unclean, elect or reprobate, of the household of the Church or not of the Church, that is baptized, be he infant, or at the years of discretion?*"*

Now here it is evident that Whitgift held that what a person was, when coming to baptism, whether adult or *infant,* that he remained after baptism.

As additional illustrations of the general character of his views on this subject, I may add, that he entirely rejects the opinion that infants are not saved without baptism; observing in reply to Cartwright's remark, that the word "water" in John iii. 5, does not mean the material water of baptism, but represents the cleansing efficacy of the Spirit's influences,—

"The place in the iii. of John by you alleged *hath divers interpretations,* and the most part of the ancient writers do take water in that place for material and elemental water: as Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Cyril, and sundry others, even as many of the ancient Fathers as I have read upon that text. But because *I do mislike as much as you the opinion of those that think infants to be condemned which are not baptized,* therefore I will not contend with you, either in the interpretation of that place, or in any other thing that you have spoken touching this *error.*"†

* p. 621. † p. 516.

And he evidently holds, that the children of baptized persons only are entitled to baptism.*

ARCHBISHOP SANDYS;

Bishop of Worcester from 1559 *to* 1570;—*Bishop of London from* 1570 *to* 1576;—*Archbishop of York from* 1576 *to* 1588.

"Christ hath instituted and left in his Church, for our *comfort* and the *confirmation of our faith*, two sacraments *or seals*; Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In baptism, the outward washing of the flesh declareth the inward purging and cleansing of the Spirit. . . . If a prince gave out his letters patent of a gift, so long as the seal is not put to, the gift is not fully ratified; and the party to whom it is given thinketh not himself sufficiently assured of it. God's gift, *without sealing*, is sure; as he himself is all one, without changing. Yet, to bear with our infirmity, and to make us more secure of his promise, to his writing and word he added these outward *signs and seals*, to *establish our faith*, and to certify us that his promise is most certain."†

BISHOP ROBERT ABBOT;

Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1612 *to* 1615;—*Bishop of Salisbury from* 1615 *to* 1617.

The character given of him by Anthony Wood has been quoted p. 105 above. And he is called by Fuller, "One of the honours not only of that See [Salisbury], but of the Church of England." (Hist. bk. x. p. 72.)

The following clear and decisive passages on the subject are taken from his reply to a treatise written by a person of the name of Thomson on the loss of justification and grace. It is appended to his work, De Gratia et Perseverantia Sanctorum. Lond. 1618. 4to.

"In like manner therefore it is to be held, that not all who are sealed according to the flesh with the baptism of water are immediately justified and sanctified, but that while the Sacrament is common to all, the power and grace of the Sacrament belong only to the children of promise; and that those only are inwardly baptized by

* See pp. 620 and 622. See also as to identity of John's baptism and that of Christ, p. 566.

† Sandys's Sermons and Pieces. Sermon 15. pp. 302, 303. P. Soc. ed.

God whom throughout all nations God testified that he would give to Abraham. Meanwhile, whoever are baptized are, *to us* and the Church, regenerated, justified, sanctified; nor to be looked upon in any other light, until they manifest themselves not to be so; not even hypocrites, who come feignedly to the Sacrament, and are altogether strangers to the reality of the Sacrament; who nevertheless, since they cannot be discerned by us, are holy so far as concerns admission to the communion and rites of the Church; nor is it of any moment to us, that we should discover what they are in the sight of God, being perhaps not to be manifested until the sheep are to be separated from the goats under the authority of Christ himself. Nor are the sayings of writers, either ancient or modern, to be otherwise interpreted, or certainly they do not give a correct view, if they attribute efficacy to the Sacraments otherwise than according to the purpose of grace, according to the good pleasure of the will of God."*

"The Holy Spirit is given in Baptism, and nevertheless since it is the Spirit of promise, it cannot be given except to the sons of promise."†

"But it is sufficiently clear, from what has been hitherto said, that Sacraments, as they are seals of the grace and promise of God, so they put forth their power spiritually in those only who are the sons of promise and heirs of grace, whom God foreknew and predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son. Although neither to them are Sacraments efficacious in one and the same way, but, the medicine being applied, it works its effect in some at an earlier, in others at a later period; and baptism, as Augustine distinguishes, is sometimes possessed long before it is possessed for any useful and saving purpose, according as it shall have seemed fit to Him who alone has the power to produce the effect."‡

---

* Perinde ergo sentiendum est, non mox justificatos et sanctificatos, quicunque secundum carnem baptismo aquæ consignati sunt, sed in communitate sacramenti tantùm ad filios promissionis pertinere baptismi vim, et gratiam; et intus Deo tinctos non nisi illos, quos per omnes gentes Deus se Abrahæ daturum testatus est. Interim nobis et Ecclesiæ regenerati, justificati, sanctificati, quicunque baptizati, neque aliter reputandi donec se alios produnt; ne hypocritæ quidem, qui ficte ad sacramentum accedunt, et a re sacramenti prorsus alieni sunt, qui tamen quia nobis cerni non possunt, ad commercia, et usus Ecclesiæ sancti sunt, neque interest nobis, ut discutiamus quales Deo sint, fortasse non ante manifestandi, quam oves ab hœdis, Christo authore, discriminandæ sunt. Neque aliter sententiæ Scriptorum, sive veterum, sive recentiorum, interpretandæ sunt, aut certe non recte sapiunt, si aliter sacramentis efficacitatem attribuunt, quam *secundum propositum gratiæ, secundum beneplacitum voluntatis Dei.* (R. Abbot in Thomsoni Diatribam de intercisione Justif. et. Grat. c. 7, pp. 116, 117.)

† Datur in baptismo Spiritus Sanctus, et tamen quia Spiritus promissionis est, *præterquam filiis promissionis dari non potest.* (Ib. p. 117.)

‡ Satis vero manifestum est, ex iis quæ hactenus dicta sunt, sacramenta, prout sigilla sunt gratiæ et promissionis Dei, ita in illis tantùm vim suam

"He who sanctified Jeremiah from the womb, and caused enmity in the very womb between Jacob and Esau, and filled John the Baptist when not yet born with joy, the Same also imbues infants according to his own pleasure with the Holy Spirit, and with grace, of which the wonderful effects are sometimes seen even from the very cradle; *so that we must not doubt of the regeneration of those to whom he denies a prolonged enjoyment of life.* But I am astonished that the words of Luther are here brought forward by our author (although they are not Luther's, in the form in which they are produced by him) whose object in those words, in that passage, is to oppose *that Papistical saying of the Scholastics, which is the foundation of the opus operatum doctrine,* WHICH HERE NEVERTHELESS IS WITH INCONCEIVABLE AUDACITY LAID DOWN AS A DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH, '*that Sacraments always confer their effect upon one that does not place a bar in the way*;' when on the contrary Luther maintained that the efficacy of all Sacraments depends solely on faith."*

"But hence it is that baptism does not require iteration, because that birth by which we are once born again from God is never destroyed; inasmuch as the grace sealed and exhibited to us in baptism, can never be blotted out; so that of necessity it is to be maintained, that that impress of the Holy Spirit is not received by the reprobate, and that they were never partakers of the justification of the saints."†

---

spiritualiter exercere, qui sunt filii promissionis, et hæredes gratiæ, quos præscivit Deus, et prædestinavit conformes faciendos imagini Filii sui. Quanquam neque illis sacramenta sunt uno modo efficacia, sed, apposita medicina, citius in aliis effectum suum, in aliis operatur seriùs; et habetur nonnunquam baptismus, ut distinguit Augustinus, multo ante quam utiliter et salubriter habeatur, prout ei visum fuerit, quem penes unum effectus est. (Ib. p. 118.)

* Qui Jeremiam ab utero sanctificavit, et inter Jacob et Esau, in ipso utero inimicitias fecit, et Joannem Baptistam nondum natum tantum gaudio perfudit, idem quoque infantulos *pro arbitrio suo* Spiritu Sancto imbuit, et gratia, cujus ab ipsis fere incunabulis mira interdum effecta cernuntur; ut de *illorum* regeneratione dubitandum non sit, *quibus longiorem vitæ usuram negat.* Miror vero hic a nostro Lutheri verba proferri, (quanquam Lutheri non sunt, ea forma qua ponuntur ab illo,) cujus, in eo loco, in verbis illis negotium est, oppugnare *Papisticum illud Scholasticorum pronunciatum, quod operis operati fundamentum est,* QUOD HIC TAMEN NESCIO QUA FRONTE TANQUAM CATHOLICÆ FIDEI DOGMA PROPONITUR, '*Sacramenta semper conferre suum effectum non ponenti obicem*,' ubi e contra Lutherus Sacramentorum omnium efficaciam tantùm a fide pendere defendit. (pp. 118, 119.)

† Inde vero est quod baptismus iteratione non egeat, quia nunquam destruitur illa nativitas, qua semel ex Deo renati sumus; quia obsignata nobis et exhibita in Baptismo gratia deleri nunquam potest; ut necessario tenendum sit, characterem illum Spiritus Sancti non cadere in reprobos, neque unquam illos justificationis sanctorum fuisse consortes. (p. 121.)

"Many *seem to us, and are called,* faithful, fearing God, justified, *regenerate,* sons of God, who yet *in reality are not such;* and are already known to God as being very different persons from what they seem to us to be."*

Bishop Abbot's opinions on this subject are still further illustrated in the 3rd part of his "Defence of the Reformed Catholic"† against Dr. Bishop.

Replying to his Romish adversary, he says,—

"Whereas he saith that we 'extinguish the virtue and efficacy of those two Sacraments,' it is only his blind conceit. We deny not but that the Sacraments are instruments of grace and of remission of sins, and yet we deny them to be so in that sort as is affirmed by the Church of Rome, namely, as to give grace *ex opere operato, for the very work wrought,* as the Schoolmen speak. It is worthily observed by St. Austin, that 'a Sacrament is as it were a visible word,' (in Joan. tr. 80.) because by it in way of signification, God as it were speaketh the same to the eye and other senses, which by the word he soundeth to the ear. Yea he affirmeth that the outward element of itself is nothing, but it is by the word that it hath whatsoever power it hath. 'Why doth not Christ say, Now are ye clean by the baptism wherewith ye are washed, but by the word which I have spoken to you, but because in the water it is the word that cleanseth? Take away the word, and what is water but water? Whence is it that the water hath so great power to touch the body and to wash the heart, but that the word doth it?' and that 'not because it is spoken, but because it is believed?' Now if the Sacrament have all his virtue and efficacy from the word, and the word have his power, not for that it is spoken, but for that it is believed, we must conceive the same of the Sacrament also, that the effect thereof standeth not in being applied by the hand of the minister, but in being believed by the faith of the receiver, God both by the one and by the other ministering and increasing faith, and the Holy Ghost accompanying both the one and the other to do that that is believed. Thus is baptism a sign of representation to the understanding, and seal of confirmation to faith, effectually delivering to the believer through the Holy Ghost the grace of God and the remission of all his sins. And why doth it trouble M. Bishop that we make baptism in this sort only 'a sign and a seal,' when as though

* Multi *videntur nobis, et dicuntur,* fideles, Deum timentes, justificati, *regenerati,* filii Dei, qui tamen *reipsa non sunt tales,* et Deo jam nunc longe alii sciuntur, quam videntur nobis. (c. 8, p. 132.)

† Lond. 1609, 4to.

signs and seals be not the things themselves, yet by signs and seals men are wont to be entitled and invested to the things signified and sealed? And hath not the Apostle himself taught us thus to speak? Gregory bishop of Rome saith, that 'what the water of baptism doth with us, the same did the mystery of circumcision with the seed of Abraham.' (Moral. lib. 4. c. 3.) But of circumcision the Apostle saith thus, 'Abraham received the sign of circumcision as the seal of the righteousness of faith.' (Rom. iv. 11.) Baptism therefore must be *to us the sign and seal of the righteousness of faith*." (pp. 172, 173.)

Again, in another part of the same work, he speaks more expressly with reference to the case of *infant* baptism. His adversary Dr. Bishop, pointing out the (supposed) errors of the Protestants on the article of the Creed relating to the forgiveness of sins, makes the following statement:—

"It is not easy to find what is their settled opinion touching the forgiveness of original sin in infants. Some attribute it to Baptism; but that cannot stand with their common doctrine, 'that sacraments have no virtue in them to remit sins, or to give grace.' Others say, that God without any means doth then, when they be baptized, of himself immediately justify them. But that cannot stand in their own doctrine, because infants want the instrument of faith to lay hold on that justice then offered by God, and therefore cannot, being so young, take it unto them. Others will have infants sanctified in their mother's womb, by virtue of a covenant, which they suppose God to have made with old father Abraham, and all his faithful servants, that (forsooth) their seed shall be holy. But this is most phantastical, and contrary to the Scriptures and daily experience: for Isaac was the son of promise, and yet Esau his son was a reprobate; David's father was a godly Israelite, and yet David affirmeth that he himself was conceived in iniquities; and we may see whole countries now turned Turks, whose ancestors were good Christians: therefore not all the souls of the faithful are sanctified in their mothers' wombs." (Ib. p. 266.)

To these statements Bishop Abbot replies thus:—

"If we were as full of differences in our doctrine as M. Bishop's head is full of idle fancies, it should be hard indeed to find any settled opinion amongst us, whereas now our opinion being settled, he out of sundry terms and words that are used in the expressing thereof, dreameth of great difference and uncertainty amongst us. The matter is concerning the forgiveness of original sin in infants. 'Some,' saith he, 'attribute it to baptism.' And whom, I marvel,

doth he know that doth otherwise? Who of us doth not acknowledge baptism to be *God's instrument for the actual application of that grace which he hath intended towards us in Jesus Christ, before the foundation of the world?* which notwithstanding hath his effect, not by the very work wrought, or by any virtue infused into the water, or by any power given to the very words and syllables that are pronounced, but by the assisting power of the Holy Ghost, accompanying the outward Sacrament to give grace and forgiveness of sins, NOT INDIFFERENTLY OR GENERALLY, BUT 'ACCORDING TO THE PURPOSE OF THE GRACE OF GOD.' (Rom. iv. 5. *vulgat.* Eph. i. 5, 9.) Now of this that we say, that it is the Holy Ghost which in baptism worketh the effect of grace, he out of the abundance of his wit frameth another opinion, which with us is no other but only the explication of the former. As for his exception, that children have not the instrument of faith to lay hold on the grace of God which is offered in baptism, it availeth nothing, because children are brought to baptism, though not in their own faith, whereof they are incapable, yet in the faith of their parents, who apprehending the promise of God according to the tenor thereof, both for themselves and for their children (Gen. xvii. 7.), do thereby derive and transport unto them an interest in the grace of God, whereby they are sacred and holy unto God, and are therefore by baptism to be received to be made partakers of that grace. Here again M. Bishop imagineth a third opinion, whereas still there is nothing said but what is dependent upon the first. And this third opinion he delivereth according to his own absurd conceit thereof, and not according to that that by us is intended. We say nothing but what the Scripture hath taught us, that 'the children of faithful parents are holy.' (1 Cor. vii. 14.) He, betwixt his pride and ignorance, will take no knowledge that the Scripture so speaketh, thereby to give a true sense and meaning of that it saith, but scornfully derideth it, and out of his own distempered brains bringeth a foolish reason to dispute against it. 'This is most phantastical,' saith he, 'and contrary to the Scriptures and daily experience.' And how so? Forsooth 'Isaac was the son of promise, and yet Esau his son was a reprobate, and many children of Christians afterwards become Turks: therefore the children of the faithful are not sanctified in their mother's womb.' But did not his eyes see that out of his own doctrine a man might by the same argument overthrow the sanctification of baptism also? For in like sort a man may say, The children of many faithful become reprobates and castaways, therefore the children of the faithful are not sanctified in baptism, which I suppose he will not admit.* Surely he knoweth

* This is an *argumentum ad hominem*, showing Dr. Bishop that his argument would be fatal to a doctrine of his own. For the Papists holds

that by the doctrine of their schools sanctification once had may afterwards be lost, and that many reprobates are for the time partakers thereof. It is then no argument to say, that because many children of the faithful are reprobates, therefore they were not sanctified in their mother's womb, because, as he will say of them, who are sanctified in baptism, so it may be answered him of them who are sanctified in their mother's womb, that by apostasy they forego that which by grace they had received. *I speak not this to affirm that sanctification which he imagineth*, but only to show him the silliness of his argument whereby he impugneth it. His other instance, as he setteth it down, is as weak as that. 'David's father was a godly Israelite, and yet David affirmeth that he himself was conceived in iniquities.' For though David were conceived in iniquities, yet that letteth not but that after his conception he might be sanctified in his mother's womb. But we do not only make him say that he was 'conceived in iniquity,' but also that he was 'born in sin' (Ps. li. 5), even as we confess generally of all, that 'we are born guilty of the wrath of God,' (Aug. Enchir. ca. 33), 'the children of wrath' (Eph. ii. 3), and that unless the grace of Christ do thenceforth relieve us, 'the wrath of God abideth upon us,' (John iii. 36.) When therefore the Apostle saith, that the children of believing parents are 'holy,' we do not thereby understand any inward endowment or gift of holiness, but only that they are with us to be holden and accounted as belonging unto God, and comprehended within his covenant, that therefore we may not doubt but that the fellowship of the grace of God, as God himself hath ordained, is to be imparted unto them. We know that many things by the law were called 'holy,' which yet were not capable of inward and spiritual holiness; and therefore albeit we say by the Apostles' phrase, that the children of the faithful are holy unto God, even from their mother's womb; yet is there no necessity to understand this holiness of any grace of inward regeneration, as they wilfully understand it: it being sufficient both to the Apostles' words, and to our meaning, that they be reckoned as belonging to God's household, partakers of his vocation and calling, designed to his use, and in case to be made partakers of his holiness." (Ib. pp. 268, 269.)

And in another part of the same work he says,—

"Many there are who are Christians in name, but not in deed;

---

that all children are sanctified in baptism, and yet that some afterwards become reprobates, and therefore they cannot *consistently* say that because in after life they are reprobates, therefore they were not sanctified in their mother's womb.

Christians to men, but not to God, Christians by outward profession and participation of sacraments, but not by inward regeneration and grace. M. Perkins namely speaketh of them who are truly justified and sanctified, who with a true heart and unfeigned faith do all upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. The rest speak prayers, but they do not pray: they repeat words with the mouth, but the heart, where is the true seat of prayer, hath no feeling of that they say. Now of them that are truly the children of God, and do faithfully and truly pray, it is undoubtedly true which M. Perkins saith, that never any doth wholly and finally fall away from the grace of God." (Ib. p. 338.)

BISHOP JOHN PRIDEAUX;

Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, from 1615 *to* 1641;—*Bishop of Worcester from* 1641 *to* 1650.

His character has been already given from Anthony Wood, in p. 105 above.

In his "Fasciculus Controversiarum Theologicarum," (ed. 2ª Oxon. 1652, 4to.), he discusses the question "Whether the Anglican Liturgy is agreeable to the Holy Scriptures," (An Liturgia Anglicana sit Sacris Literis conformis,") (pp. 235 et seq.), defending of course the affirmative. And replying to objections raised against it, he gives the following objection and answer,—

"*Ob.* In Baptism *Regeneration* is affirmed, as the effect, by the mere work wrought, of the Sacrament; which is *Popish*.

"*Ans.* Baptism promises only *external* and *sacramental* Regeneration: and that this produces the internal regeneration of the Holy Spirit, THE CHURCH PRONOUNCES IN THE JUDGMENT OF CHARITY."*

In another part of the same work, treating on the doctrine of the Sacraments, (pp. 278 et seq.), he discusses the question,—

"Whether the sacraments confer grace by the mere work wrought."†

---

* Obj. In Baptismo *regeneratio* urgetur, ut *opus* Sacramenti *operatum* quod est *Papisticum*.

Resp. Regenerationem tantùm *externam* et *sacramentalem* spondet *Baptismus*, quam *internam* S.S. regenerationem perficere, EX CHARITATE PRONUNCIAT ECCLESIA. (p. 240.)

† An Sacramenta conferant gratiam ex opere operato?

And he replies, "I deny that they do, Because,—

"1. Signs and seals contain nothing in themselves and confer nothing, but only *signify* and *seal* the fact, that grace has been already given, or even is afterwards to be given. But such only are sacraments, as is evident from the 17th chapter of Genesis compared with the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

"2. Abraham, the Father of those that believe, the Eunuch and Cornelius received saving grace, and believed, before they were initiated by any *opus operatum* of the sacraments, as is clear from Gen. xv. 6; Rom. iv. 10, 11; Acts x. 2. Therefore the sacraments that supervened only sealed this grace to them, and did not confer it."*

He adds several other reasons.

He then proceeds to meet objections; and among them are the two following, and the answers.

"*Ob.* 2. The Sacraments of the New Testament have supplied more than those of the Old. But the latter were seals, sealing the grace given. Therefore the sacraments of the New Testament confer grace.

"*Sol.* The efficacy of the Sacraments of both Testaments was one and the same; not arising from the mere work wrought by the administrator of the rite, and the fitness of the recipient, but from the goodwill of him who bestows it."†

"*Ob.* 7. Baptism and the Eucharist are of the same efficacy: but the baptized most certainly obtain salvation in water that is consecrated, as Jordan by the baptism of our Saviour, as is said in the Anglican Liturgy concerning Baptism; and they are efficacious signs of grace, through which God acts upon us. Therefore when they are rightly administered, grace is obtained from them by covenant.

---

* Signa et sigilla nil in se continent, vel conferunt, sed gratiam jam fore collatam, vel etiam postea conferendam, tantùm *significant* et *obsignant*: Talia autem sunt tantùm Sacramenta, ut patet ex Gen. 17, collato cum 4to. cap. ad Roman.

2. Abraham pater credentium, Eunuchus, et Cornelius prius salutarem gratiam receperunt, et crediderunt, quam Sacramentorum aliquo opere operato fuerunt initiati, ut patet Gen. xv. 6; Rom. iv. 10, 11; Act x. 2. Ergo Sacramenta supervenientia hanc illis gratiam obsignarunt tantùm, non contulerunt. (p. 278.)

† *Ob.* 2. Plus præstiterunt Sacramenta N. T. quam V. Illa autem erant sigilla, gratiam collatam obsignantia. Ergo Sacramenta N. T. gratiam conferunt.

Sol. Eadem erat Sacramentorum utriusque Testamenti efficacia, non ex opere operato administrantis, et recipientis habitudine, sed ex conferentis *benignitate*. (p. 279.)

"*Sol.* It is granted that the effect attends the work wrought, but not that it is produced by the work wrought, but by His *most free grace* who works all that is salutary in all, ACCORDING TO HIS OWN GOOD PLEASURE."*

Such is the testimony of one who for a quarter of a century was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and was appointed to a Bishopric even under the Archiepiscopate of Laud.

BISHOP HERBERT WESTFALING;

Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford, from 1562 *to* 1563;—*Bishop of Hereford, from* 1585 *to* 1601.

Unfortunately the subject of Baptism is only noticed *incidentally* by Bishop Westfaling, in a sermon on the Lord's Supper. But *so far as this notice goes,* so far the doctrine inculcated is of the same character as that of all his brethren already referred to. He maintains a spiritual presence in both Sacraments, *offering* the blessing appropriate to each to the *faithful* recipient, but not that the blessing is *conferred* upon all comers *ex opere operato, by the mere work wrought.*

"By baptism," he says, "is *sealed* and OFFERED our new birth, and the benefits thereto belonging."† "In such sort as the water in baptism is forgiveness of sins and our spiritual regeneration; so, even so, in the Sacrament of thanksgiving is the bread and wine the body and blood of our Saviour; that is to say, not in substance, but in signification."‡

He then proceeds to show, that "the things signified" are "present with the things whereby they are signified," so far as to be *offered* by them, and ready for reception by the spiritual mind.

---

* *Ob.* 7. Ejusdem sunt efficaciæ Baptismus et Eucharistia: sed Baptizati certo certius salutem consequuntur, in aqua sanctificata, ut Jordan per Salvatoris baptismum, ut habetur in Liturgia Anglicana de Baptismo, et sunt signa efficacia gratiæ, per quæ Deus in nos operatur. Ergo istis recte administratis gratia ex pacto consequitur.

Sol. Conceditur effectum comitari opus operatum, sed non ab opere operato effici, verum *ab illius gratia liberrima*, qui operatur omnia salutaria in omnibus, PROUT IPSI COMPLACUIT. (p. 281.)

† A Treatise of Reformation in Religion, &c. Hereunto are added two Sermons touching the Supper of the Lord. Lond. 1582, 4to, fol. 100.

‡ Ibid.

"When did he [God] by any sensible element make promise to give any spiritual thing, but the same was *offered*, and TO BE RECEIVED was present in deed? Tell me, I beseech you, who among all the Israelites sprinkled their door-posts with the Paschal Lamb's blood in the great slaughter of the Egyptians' first-born, and was not by the angel of the Lord certainly passed over? Who according to God's will appeared before the Ark and Propitiatory to ask or learn aught, and was not from time to time evermore answered? Who being stung with fiery serpents looked (as God appointed) upon the serpent of brass, which he made to be erected, and was not presently healed? Who circumcided the foreskin of his flesh, and was not reckoned among God's people, and had not his grace verily *offered* unto him? To be short, who ever doubted, or what question can there be, but that, together with the Dove, the Holy Ghost was present? With the fiery and cloven tongues, knowledge of languages, and boldness of speech? With the washing of water in baptism, God's sanctifying spirit and remission of sins? For this much the Scripture manifestly assureth us of, in that it saith, when the Dove only was seen, the Spirit of God was seen (Matt. iii. 16); when tongues only appeared to come down upon the Apostles, the Holy Ghost came upon them (Acts i. 8 and ii. 3.); when men were only known to be outwardly baptized, they were justified, sanctified, and washed from their sins. (1 Cor. vi. 11.) For were not these things which were signified, so joined to the signs which did signify the same, as the receiver of the sign EITHER did, or at leastwise MIGHT therewithal certainly receive the thing signified too, never would the Holy Ghost have used these manner of speeches, nor have given to the things signifying, the names of the things signified thereby. Seeing then, in the Supper of the Lord, bread and wine are offered us, not only to signify, that our Saviour's body crucified and blood shed are the same to our souls, that bread and wine are to our bodies; but also to assure us, that as verily as the bread and wine is then offered to our bodies, so verily the body and blood of our Saviour is then *offered* to our souls for the nourishment of the same; how can it be, that the body and blood of our Saviour should not also in the holy mysteries be present in deed?"*

And having thus shewn in what way he holds the things signified to be present with the Sacramental signs, he proceeds to show how they are *received*. And he commences with the remark,—

* Ib. fol. 106, 107.

"Marvel it is, but some do look, that I should now confirm, that they [*i. e.* our Saviour's body and blood] are notwithstanding present to our bodies, and *so present with the Sacramental bread and wine, that every one receiving these signs of them, together with the same verily receiveth them, be he good or be he evil.*"*

But,—

"Christ's body and blood are not so present with the Sacramental signs that our body may be said to receive them, *or that every one which receiveth the Sacramental signs may be said to receive them.*"†

Christ is received so far as he is "*by our spirit and faith* made present unto us."‡

"Thus present Christ is *only received of those whom he maketh withal partakers of life everlasting ;* but the other presence letteth such eat him as nevertheless shall die the death. Thus present Christ is *only received of those that are* INCORPORATED INTO HIM : but the other presence letteth him to be received of those that *have no part with him.* Thus present CHRIST CANNOT BE RECEIVED BUT BY FAITH, a spiritual instrument : but the other presence needeth only our mouth, a corporal instrument."§

Now he himself has before spoken of the nature of the presence in the Sacrament of Baptism as identical with that in the Eucharist, and consequently the *reception* of the blessing *offered* is to be in the same way in both cases. And the last extract contains words which indirectly but plainly shew, that he did not consider all that had been baptized in infancy as "members of Christ," for he draws a distinction between those who come to the Eucharist, (*all* of whom must have been baptized,) intimating that some only are "incorporated into Christ," and others "have no part with him." And so he tells us elsewhere, that "faith" is "the mean whereby we are graffed into Christ, as St. Paul teacheth us, Rom. xi. 22."‖

So he says elsewhere,—

"Christ I say himself as often as these holy mysteries be celebrated, is most certainly *offered* unto all that come to feed upon them. . . . *For as God dealeth with us in one Sacrament, so he dealeth with us in another* : as he dealeth with us in the Sacrament of Baptism,

* fol. 108. † fol. 109. ‡ Ib. § fol. 111. ‖ fol. 94.

whereby we are received into his family, so he dealeth with us in the Supper of the Lord, whereby he *feedeth us so received.*"*

But as he said in the above extract, that those *only* were so fed in the Eucharist that were "incorporated into Christ," so it follows, that he held that not all were received into God's family by baptism; because *all* that come to the Eucharist are *baptized.*

Hence when he says,—

"In baptism not only is the sign given, but the thing signified also, not the figure only, but the thing and truth figured also; not only water to wash the body, but God's Holy Spirit also to wash and cleanse the soul—"†

Or again,—

"There [*i. e.* in baptism] are we taught, not by hearing alone, but by our sight also, and feeling (as it were), that we be as surely washed from our sins, received into favour and endued with God's Holy Spirit, as by water the body's filth is cleansed, men's thirst quenched, and the ground made fruitful—"‡

He is speaking only in the same way as we have so frequently had to observe is common to all the Protestant divines, that is, speaking of the Sacrament as it is when its full end and purpose are realized.

And in the context he remarks, that this mode of speaking is used by the Apostle, 1 Cor. x. 16; observing,—

"Because the one [the sign] offered us witnesseth, that the other [the thing signified] is *offered* us also, *therefore the Apostle affirmeth the partaking of the sign to be a partaking of the thing itself.*"§

Hence he briefly describes the two Sacraments thus,—

"Baptism instituted to assure us of our new birth, and receiving into the favour and family of God."——"The Supper of the Lord instituted to assure us of *our continuance in Christ, and of our nourishment after we be received into the family of God.*"‖

But the spiritual effect is not to be assumed to be any more realized in all comers in the former of these two cases than in the latter.

The way in which the Sacrament of Baptism becomes efficacious in the case of infants, consistently with this doctrine, I

* fol. 90. † fol. 90. ‡ fol. 100. § fol. 91. ‖ *Margin*, fol. 100.

shall point out hereafter, when considering the statements of Bishop Davenant and others.

DR. JAMES CALFHILL;

Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1563 *to* 1565;—*Archdeacon of Colchester from* 1565 *to* 1570;—*died Bishop elect of Worcester* 1570.

In his "Answer to the Treatise of the Cross,"* written by John Martial, he thus expresses himself; showing that he held that children were baptized as those *previously* made partakers of divine grace.

"As for the example of Christ, who embraced little children in his arms, and, laying his hands upon their heads, blessed them, I answer, that as every fact of Christ doth not serve for our imitation, but instruction; so must we not make a Sacrament of each of them. For so the breathing upon his Apostles, whereby he gave them the Holy Ghost, should be a Sacrament. Only this sign may be a precedent for us, that children appertain to the kingdom of God; *that they ought not* [*to*] *be denied the sign, which* ARE PARTAKERS OF THE GRACE; AND THEREFORE *should be baptized.*"†

Again, observing that miracles wrought in confirmation of the truth of a doctrine, "in some condition be like to Sacraments," he adds,—

"For both are added as assurances to promises, as seals to writings. And as *Sacraments do bring no comfort, unless they be received by faith;* so miracles do not avail, except we have first a regard to doctrine."‡

DR. SEBASTIAN BENEFIELD;

Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1613 *to* 1626.

I quote from his work entitled, "The Sin against the Holy

---

* First printed, Lond. 1565. Reprinted for the Parker Society, Lond. 1846, 8vo.

† Park. Soc. ed. p. 215. ‡ Ib. p. 320.

Ghost discovered, and other Christian Doctrines delivered, in Twelve Sermons upon part of Heb. x." Oxf. 1615. 4to.

"The general sanctity, [*i. e.* of the Church,] I call that by which the Church visible and militant, consisting of good and evil, of dissemblers and hypocrites as well as of the godly, is called, though not truly and properly, yet καταχρηστικως, συνεκδοχικως, in a figurative kind of speech, *tota sancta*, the *Holy Church*.... Neither should this seem strange, that hypocrites, dissemblers, and godless men are called *holy*. For whosoever give their names to Christ and are *baptized into his name*, though all of them be *not truly grafted into Christ*, nor all of them be truly baptized into Christ's death and resurrection; *that is, though all of them be not new born and regenerate;* yet, in the Scripture phrase, after the custom of the Scriptures, they are all called *holy*, and have other such titles given them, as indeed may beseem the *blessed of the Lord*. In this sense, St. Paul saith, that all the Romans are *saints, beloved of God*, Rom. i. 7, and that all the Galatians are *sons of God*, Gal. iii. 26, and that all the Corinthians are *washed* and *sanctified* and *justified*, 1 Cor. vi. 11." (p. 102.)

"It followeth, that the places now alleged must be understood of that general sanctity, by which men may be said to be sanctified, justified, cleansed, washed, and the like; though *not truly, not before God*, yet *in the face of the Church, and before men;* as it were, sacramentally." (Ib. p. 104.)

"How far a man may go in the profession of the Gospel, and yet be a reprobate? I answer thus in general: So carry thyself outwardly in the profession of the Gospel, that no exception may be taken against thee; let thy life be such, as that the sons of God, which live with thee in the bosom of the same Church, can judge no otherwise of thee than of a rightful heir to eternal happiness; be it, that they think of thee much better than of themselves,—yet will not all this exempt thee from being a reprobate. What thou art inwardly and in the sight of God, God alone knoweth; he alone is καρδιογνωστης, and sees and knows thy heart. Since thou hast given thy name to Christ, and hast *had the washing of the new birth, the Church* IN CHARITY *must judge of thee, as of one truly grafted into Christ, and truly regenerate*; but (I say) *what thou art inwardly and in the sight of God, God knoweth;* examine thou thyself." (pp. 104, 105.)

"This their knowledge of Christ is, in the elect, the *beginning of regeneration*." (p. 105.)

DR. WILLIAM WHITAKER;

Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge from 1580 *to* 1595; *Master of St. John's College from* 1586 *to* 1595.

The high character of Dr. Whitaker is too well known to need any remarks respecting it. The following passages are from his Lectures on the Sacraments when Regius Professor."* The subject is here so fully handled, and the clear and decisive statements in opposition to the modern "High Church" notions so numerous, that the only difficulty is, to make a selection from them. The first portion of the Lectures is devoted to the discussion of the doctrine of the Sacraments in general, the second to the Sacrament of Baptism, and the third to the Eucharist. I shall give the passages as they occur in the work, beginning with the portion on the Sacraments; interspersing some passages to shew, that his denial of the *universal* efficacy of Baptism, even in the case of infants, did not prevent his entertaining a high view of its value and efficacy to worthy recipients.

"Sacraments not only signify, but also seal, and actually exhibit that which they signify, *when rightly used;* so that he who comes to Baptism, or to the Eucharist, *rightly prepared*, receives together with the signs the things themselves: for they are not barren or empty signs."†

"We do not deny that Sacraments do in their measure work grace as means and instruments, but inasmuch as they [*i. e.* the Papists] bind grace to the Sacraments, and include it in the Sacraments, as if they brought grace of themselves, we cannot approve of their views. For the Sacraments are not appointed for that end that they should infuse grace through their own nature or of themselves, or that they should have an intrinsic secret power of sanctifying, permanently implanted in them, as they hold; so that although you should not believe the promises, yet the Sacraments should cause you to believe, and justify you. But we say that the Sacraments were instituted, not that they should impart faith, but that they should confirm the faith *before imparted*, in its hold upon the promises, and seal the same promises to

* Prælectiones de Sacramentis in genere, et in specie de S.S. Baptismo et Eucharistia. Francof. 1624. 4to.

† Sacramenta non modo significant, sed et obsignant, et actu exhibent id quod significant, in *legitimo usu;* ut qui aut ad Baptismum aut ad Eucharistiam *recte præparatus* accedit, is una cum signis res ipsas percipit: non enim inania aut vacua signa sunt. (p. 6.)

us; and we say that the force of the Sacraments is this, that the Sacraments confer no grace on those who do not believe the promises; but on those who believe them, the greatest."*

"CALVIN INDEED SAYS, AND CORRECTLY, THAT THE SACRAMENTS PROFIT NONE BUT THE PREDESTINATE."†

"Calvin, says Bellarmine, understands it to be a naked sign, that is, one which only signifies. But this is notoriously false. For Calvin always maintains that he does not understand it to be a naked sign, but affirms that the thing is always joined with the signs when they are rightly used; and *the same* we *all* say: but nevertheless they continue to misrepresent us."‡

"A Sacrament is defined *from its legitimate use and end*, as Baptism is called 'the laver of regeneration,' yet *not all are regenerated who are washed with the baptismal water*, but it is so called on the part of God who offers the blessing: and it is the fault of men that it is not to them the laver of regeneration, who play the hypocrite before God and men."§

"That conscience is rightly mentioned in the definition of a Sacrament, appears from the Apostle Peter, who teaches that there is required in Baptism 'the answer of a good conscience toward God.' If a good conscience is required in Baptism, much more is it required in the Eucharist. But as to what Bellarmine says, that little children have not a conscience nor actual faith, and so are not to be baptized; this is an argument of the Anabaptists. But the answer is easy; that

---

* Sacramenta efficere gratiam ut media et instrumenta suo modo non negamus, sed quia illi [*i. e.* Pontificii] gratiam ad Sacramenta alligant, et in Sacramentis includunt, sic ut per se gratiam afferant, non possumus probare. Neque enim instituta in eum finem Sacramenta sunt, ut gratiam infundant ex natura sua et per se, aut ut in se vim arcanam sanctificandi habeant perpetuo insitam, ut illi volunt, sic ut, licet non credas promissionibus, tamen Sacramenta faciant ut credas, et te justificent. Nos vero Sacramenta instituta esse dicimus, non ut fidem infundant, sed ut fidem *antea infusam* confirment in promissionibus, easdemque promissiones nobis obsignent; et vim Sacramentorum eam esse dicimus, ut iis, qui non credunt promissionibus, nullam gratiam Sacramenta conferant, iis vero qui credunt, maximam. (p. 7.)

† AIT QUIDEM CALVINUS, ET RECTE, PRODESSE NULLIS SACRAMENTA, NISI PRÆDESTINATIS. (p. 8.)

‡ Calvinus, inquit [Bellarminus], intelligit nudum esse symbolum, id est, quod solum significet. At hoc insigniter falsum. Semper enim Calvinus se non nudum symbolum intelligere profitetur, sed rem esse semper in recto usu cum symbolis conjunctam affirmat; *idemque* omnes nos dicimus: et tamen isti pergunt calumniari. (p. 9.)

§ Sacramentum definitur ex *legitimo usu et fine*, ut Baptismus λουτρον παλιγγενεσιας, *i. e.* lavacrum regenerationis dicitur, *non tamen regenerantur omnes qui aqua Baptismali lavantur*, sed ex parte Dei offerentis sic vocatur: hominum vero culpa est quod illis lavacrum regenerationis non sit, qui coram Deo et hominibus simulant. (p. 10.)

little children, although they do not believe, nor have consciences, yet are *baptized in respect of future faith and repentance and a good conscience;* it is not always necessary, as Calvin remarks, that the thing should precede the sign in the order of time; therefore the promise of the Divine good-will is sealed to the consciences of infants, not while they are infants, but afterwards when they have grown up, and begun to have the use of reason."*

"What Bellarmine says is false, that infants are baptized among us only in order that they may be members of the external Church, since neither the infants of the Jews formerly were circumcised on that account only; but that the sign of the Divine covenant may be impressed upon them, WHICH, ALTHOUGH IT AVAILS NOTHING TO THOSE NOT BORN AGAIN AND PREDESTINATED, NEVERTHELESS IS OF AVAIL TO THE ELECT IN A WAY KNOWN TO GOD. For God renews elect infants, dying before they have grown up, by the power of his Spirit; but if their life happens to be prolonged, they are the more excited to desire renovation from the knowledge that as infants they have received its symbol. Therefore although they are baptized when infants, yet they will not always be infants, but at length, if longer life is granted them, they will feel the power of that baptism which they received as infants."†

"The adversaries say that the Sacraments not only confer grace, but even confer it from the mere work wrought. Here the grammarians must pardon us: for sophists do not suffer themselves to be

---

* Conscientiæ mentionem recte fieri in sacramenti definitione, ex Apostolo Petro patet, qui docet in Baptismo requiri *συνειδησεως αγαθης επερωτημα εις Θεον*, conscientiæ bonæ stipulationem erga Deum. Si in Baptismo bona conscientia requiritur, multo magis in Eucharistia. Quod autem ait [Bellarminus], parvulos non habere conscientiam nec fidem actualem, ac proinde non esse baptizandos; hoc Anabaptistarum argumentum est. Sed responsio facilis est; parvulos, etsi non credant, nec conscientias habeant, tamen *in futuram fidem et pœnitentiam et conscientiam bonam baptizari;* non nempe necesse est, ut Calvinus ait, rem esse priorem signo temporis ordine; ergo infantium conscientiis divinæ benevolentiæ promissio obsignatur, non dum infantes sunt, sed postea cum adoleverint, et usum rationis habere cœperint. (pp. 14, 15.)

† Falsum est quod ait Bellarminus baptizari apud nos infantes ea solum de causa, ut sint membra Ecclesiæ externæ, quemadmodum nec circumcisi olim infantes Judæorum sunt, illa tantum de causa; sed ut illis signum divini fœderis imprimatur, QUOD, ETSI NON RENATIS ET PRÆDESTINATIS NIL PRODEST, TAMEN ELECTIS PRODEST EO MODO QUO DEUS NOVIT. Nam *infantes electos*, morientes antequam adoleverint, Deus virtute Spiritus sui renovat, si vero vitam longius propagare *illis* contigerit eo magis ad studium renovationis accenduntur, quod ejus tesseram se infantes accepisse sciunt. Ergo etsi infantes baptizantur, tamen non semper infantes erunt, sed tandem, si vita illis longior concedatur, vim ejus baptismi sentient, quem infantes susceperunt. (p. 15.)

restrained by any laws either of grammar or theology: nor do we blame the solecism of the words so much as that of the sense; for it is intolerable. And this 'work wrought' (opus operatum) was unheard of by the antient Church, and was lately invented by the Schoolmen—by Scotus, I think; but now is approved by the authority of the Council of Trent, so that it is now fully authorized, and the Papists openly and fiercely contend for the 'work wrought.'"*

"*The Papists maintain, that grace is conferred upon little children in the Sacraments of the New Testament without faith, or any good motion. This is to attribute a power to sacraments of themselves and by a virtue of their own in the case of little children: which we say is false. For we assert that grace is not conferred by the Sacraments even upon little children from the work wrought, so that all necessarily have grace that receive the Sacraments.*"†

"What therefore do we say? Do we take away all grace from the Sacraments? Far from it; although they indeed falsely charge us with so doing. For we say that they are most efficacious instruments of the Holy Spirit, and are also instrumental causes of grace: and this they also say; *but they say it in one sense, we in another.* We say that they are instruments, taking that title in a wide sense, because God uses them in bestowing grace upon us. . . . Therefore the Sacraments are not instrumental causes of grace through their working anything of themselves, but because, when the Sacraments are applied, God works grace in the soul: therefore the Sacraments effect nothing through the work wrought, that is, merely because they are applied, *not even in little children. For not even little children partake of grace merely because they are baptized;* and yet they are not baptized to no purpose, because they are baptized *in respect of future faith and repentance,* and because they are members of the Church, and holy by covenant, and therefore the sign of the covenant is not to be denied them: but when grown up, unless they believe the Gospel, they derive

---

* Dicunt adversarii non modò conferre gratiam [sacramenta], sed etiam ex opere operato conferre. Hic nobis dent veniam Grammatici, necesse est: non enim Sophistæ ullis aut Grammaticæ aut Theologiæ legibus teneri se patiuntur; neque nos tam verborum quam sententiæ solœcismum reprehendimus; est enim intolerabilis. Et præsens olim Ecclesiæ inauditum hoc opus operatum fuit, a Scholasticis nuper, Scoto, opinor, inventum; at nunc authoritate Concilii Tridentini comprobatur, ut nunc sit plane legitimum, et Papistæ palam et acriter pro opere operato dimicent. (p. 56.)

† *Statuunt illi* [i. e. *Pontificii*], *conferri gratiam parvulis in sacramentis Novi Testamenti sine fide, aut ullo bono motu. Hoc est tribuere vim Sacramentis per se et sua in parvulis; quod nos falsum esse dicimus. Non enim ex opere operato ne parvulis quidem gratiam conferri a Sacramentis affirmamus, ut necesse sit habere gratiam omnes, qui sacramenta percipiunt.* (p. 58.)

no benefit from the Sacraments: and thus, all the virtue of the Sacraments depends upon faith."*

"Even if we grant that baptism is here [i. e. in John iii. 5.] treated of, yet nothing can be deduced hence from which we can draw the conclusion that Baptism justifies us by the work wrought. For water in Baptism is a sacrament of our renovation and regeneration, and thus we are born again of water, but only sacramentally, because the water signifies and seals our new birth, which the Holy Spirit works in us."†

"In Baptism we are said to be cleansed and saved, because Baptism is a pledge and earnest of our salvation, and because in the right and legitimate use of Baptism salvation is bestowed upon us, and remission of sins. . . . God in Baptism, as he signifies the remission of sins and salvation, so he really works them; and *the truth is joined with the sign* IN THE ELECT."‡

"Neither yet do the Fathers say anything else than what we say, that we become in Baptism new men, and that our sins are remitted, and that the Holy Spirit is efficacious. We grant all these things; but it does not therefore follow, that the Sacraments confer grace by the work wrought, as if, because they are efficacious instruments of

---

* Quid ergo nos dicimus? omnemne a sacramentis gratiam removemus? absit; etsi illi quidem de nobis sic mentiuntur. Dicimus enim esse efficacissima organa Spiritus Sancti, et esse causas etiam instrumentales gratiæ; et hoc illi etiam dicunt; sed aliter illi, aliter nos. Nos dicimus esse instrumenta, sumendo hoc nomen large, quia Deus iis utitur in conferendo nobis gratiam. . . . Non ergo sunt sacramenta causæ instrumentales gratiæ, aliquid per se operando, sed quia sacramentis adhibitis Deus in anima gratiam operatur: ergo sacramenta nihil ex opere operato efficiunt, id est, ob id tantum quia adhibentur, *ne quidem in parvulis. Non enim parvuli, eo tantùm quòd baptizantur, gratiam participant;* nec tamen frustra baptizantur, quia in futuram fidem et pœnitentiam baptizantur, et quia membra sunt Ecclesiæ, et sancti ex fœdere, ideoque signum fœderis iis negandum non est: adulti vero nisi credant Evangelio, nullam ex sacramentis utilitatem percipiunt; atque ita, omnis vis sacramentorum ex fide pendet. (Ib. pp. 62, 63.)

† Etiamsi demus hic [Joh. iii. 5.] agi de Baptismo, tamen nihil hinc elici posse, unde intelligamus Baptismum nos ex opere operato justificare. Nam aqua in Baptismo est Sacramentum renovationis et regenerationis nostræ, et sic ex aqua renascimur, sed sacramentaliter tantùm, quia aqua significat et obsignat novam nostram nativitatem, quam in nobis Spiritus Sanctus operatur. (p. 65.)

‡ In Baptismo mundari et salvari dicimur, quia Baptismus pignus et arrha est nostræ salutis, et quia in recto et legitimo usu Baptismi confertur nobis salus et remissio peccatorum. . . . Deus in Baptismo ut significat remissionem peccatorum et salutem, ita re operatur; et *veritas cum signo conjuncta est* IN ELECTIS. (p. 69.)

the Holy Spirit, therefore they are efficacious by their own power and by the work wrought."*

"We do not deny that Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration, even in little children: but not by the work wrought. *God works freely, and in Baptism sanctifies whom he pleases.*"†

"We say that without faith the Sacraments are altogether useless. For although we can receive the Sacraments without faith, yet we cannot receive the thing represented by the Sacrament, as the Schoolmen themselves confess; they are always Sacraments on account of the institution of Christ, but they never profit without faith. Thus, as regards their being, the Sacraments do not depend upon faith, but as regards their effect and benefit, they do depend upon it."‡

"This promise ['I will be thy God and the God of thy seed'] belongs to the seed: therefore to the children of the faithful, because they are the children of the faithful: for God promises that he will be a God not only to Abraham, but also to his seed; whence any one of the posterity of Abraham can claim this promise: in like manner all the children of Christians can claim the same by right of birth, because they are the children of believers. Thirdly, as to what Bellarmine says, that faith makes children of Abraham; that is, that those are to be reckoned true children of Abraham, who are children of his faith, not his flesh, and proves it from Rom. iv. & ix., and from Gal. iii. & iv., I reply that that is not only now true, but also was true under the Old Testament: for Isaac was his true son, Ishmael a bastard; for God says to Abraham, 'In Isaac shall thy seed be called' (Gen. xxi. 12); not in Ishmael. *As therefore under the Old Testament this promise had its complete fulfilment only in the elect, so it is also under the New Testament.* Fourthly, as to what he says, that we then begin to be sons of Abraham, when we begin to be believers, which little children do not do, until they are baptized; I

---

* Nec tamen Patres aliud dicunt, quam quod nos dicimus, fieri nos in Baptismo novos homines, et peccata nobis remitti, et Spiritum Sanctum esse efficacem: omnia hæc nos damus; sed non ideo sequitur, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato, quasi quia sunt efficacia organa Spiritus Sancti, ideo vi sua et ex opere operato efficacia sunt. (p. 70.)

† Baptismum esse sacramentum regenerationis, non negamus, etiam in parvulis; sed non ex opere operato. *Deus operatur liberè et in Baptismo sanctificat, quos vult.* (p. 73.)

‡ Sine fide inutilia prorsus sacramenta esse dicimus. Licet enim sacramenta possumus percipere sine fide, tamen rem sacramenti non possumus, ut ipsi scholastici fatentur: sacramenta semper sunt propter Christi institutionem, sed nunquam prosunt sine fide. Ita quoad substantiam sacramenta non pendent ex fide, quoad fructum vero et beneficium pendent. (p. 78.)

answer ; that little children are children of Abraham before they are baptized, even as soon as they are born : *for otherwise they ought not to be baptized.* As formerly under the Old Testament no infant was circumcised, except he was a child of Abraham, because God made this promise, 'I will be thy God,' to none but the seed of Abraham ; so now no one is brought to Baptism, except on account of his being a child of Abraham : therefore they do not become in Baptism children of Abraham, but because they are children of Abraham, therefore they are baptized; as circumcision formerly did not make children of Abraham, but because any one was a child of Abraham, therefore he was circumcised ; therefore to bring any one to baptism now, who is not a child of Abraham, is to affix a seal to a false document.... . Moreover therefore since the privilege granted to Abraham and the covenant made with Abraham belong to us, as all the children of Abraham were in the covenant, so are all ours ; and as God was a God to all his children, even before the eighth day, nay as soon as they were born, inasmuch as he said, 'I will be thy God and the God of thy seed,' so also is he to our children before baptism : and since the former promise, by the confession of Bellarmine, is one of remission of sins and eternal life, therefore the latter promise belongs by virtue of the Covenant to all the children of Christians, *whomsoever God shall have chosen.*"*

---

* Hæc promissio ['Ero Deus tuus et seminis tui'] pertinet ad semen : ergo ad liberos fidelium, eo quod fidelium liberi sint : Deus enim non modo se Abrahæ, sed et ejus semini se Deum fore promittit ; unde quivis e posteris Abrahæ potuit hanc promissionem vendicare : similiter omnes Christianorum liberi possunt eandem jure natalium vendicare, quia ex fidelibus nascuntur. Tertio, quod ait [Bellarminus] fidem facere filios Abrahæ, id est, eos pro veris filiis Abrahæ habendos, qui fidei non carnis filii sunt, idque ex Romanorum 4 et 9 ; et ex Galat. 3 et 4. probat, dico illud non solum nunc verum esse, sed etiam in vetere Testamento verum fuisse : nam Isaac ejus verus filius, Ismael adulterinus fuit ; Deus enim Abrahæ ait, In Isaaco vocabitur semen tuum (Gen. xxi. 12) ; non in Ismaele. *Sicut ergo in vetere Testamento non nisi in electis suum plenum complementum habuit hæc promissio : similiter etiam in novo Testamento.* Quartò, quod ait, tum nos incipere esse filios Abrahæ, cum incipimus esse fideles, quod parvuli non faciunt, nisi cum baptizantur ; respondeo : parvulos esse filios Abrahæ, antequam baptizantur, etiam ut primum nati sunt : alias enim non deberent baptizari. Ut olim in vetere Testamento nullus infans circumcisus est, nisi qui fuit Abrahæ filius, quia Deus nulli nisi Abrahæ semini hanc promissionem fecit, 'Ero Deus tuus :' ita nunc nemo ad Baptismum adducitur, nisi quod Abrahæ filius sit : non ergo fiunt Abrahæ filii in Baptismo, sed quia sunt Abrahæ filii, ideo baptizantur ; ut circumcisio olim non fecit Abrahæ filiorum [filios], sed quia quis Abrahæ filius fuit, ideo est circumcisus : ergo adducere aliquem ad Baptismum nunc, qui non sit filius Abrahæ, est sigillum affigere falso diplomati. . . . Jam ergo cum privilegium Abrahæ et fœdus cum Abraha factum ad nos pertineat, sicut omnes Abrahæ liberi erant in fœdere, sic nostri omnes ; et sicut Deus omnibus ejus liberis erat

"It appears, therefore, that express faith is required in adults, but that it is sufficient for little children to have faith in an incipient state in its principle and root, that is, the Holy Spirit, with which they are endued, from which faith and the other virtues flow at their proper time: for infants are cleansed by the Holy Spirit, since they are in the Church and belong to the Church: for Christ sanctified the Church, 'cleansing it with the laver of water by the word.' If they belong to the Church, they are furnished with the Spirit; if they are received into heaven, they are cleansed from sin; this is done by the Holy Spirit without the act of faith; *nor is this grace infused in Baptism, as the Papists say, but sealed, since the infants of believers are holy before baptism by the grace of God which is joined with his covenant.* Therefore infants are not baptized, that they may become holy, but because they are holy, therefore they are baptized, that is, they receive the seal."*

Many other similar passages might be added; but these are, I suppose, more than sufficient to shew his views.

BISHOP JOHN DAVENANT,

Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge from 1609 *to* 1621; —*President of Queen's College, Cambridge, from* 1614 *to* 1621; —*Bishop of Salisbury from* 1621 *to* 1641.

Bishop Davenant, as Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, delivered Lectures upon St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians. His doctrine as there delivered may be judged of by the following extracts. I give first the passages in which he speaks of baptism in general and in the abstract, where the reader will observe that he speaks of it, without hesitation, as it is when

---

Deus, etiam ante octavum diem, imo ut primum nati sunt, quia dixit, 'Ero Deus tuus et seminis tui,' sic et nostris liberis ante Baptismum: et cum illa promissio confitente Bellarmino sit remissionis peccatorum et vitæ æternæ, ergo promissio hæc ad omnes Christianorum liberos, *quoscunque Deus elegerit*, ex vi fœderis pertinet. (pp. 233, 234.)

* Fidem igitur expressam requiri in adultis, in parvulis sufficere fidem inchoatam in suo principio et radice, id est, Spiritu Sancto, quo præditi sunt, ex quo fides suo tempore et virtutes aliæ manant: nam infantes a Spiritu Sancto purgari, cum sint in Ecclesia et ad Ecclesiam pertineant: Ecclesiam autem Christus sanctificavit, 'mundans eam lavacro aquæ per verbum.' Si ad Ecclesiam pertinent, Spiritu ornantur, si in cœlum recipiuntur, a peccato purgantur; hoc fieri a Spiritu Sancto sine actu fidei: *neque, ut Papistæ dicunt, infundi hanc gratiam in Baptismo, sed obsignari, cum sancti sint infantes fidelium ante Baptismum Dei gratia*, quæ cum ejus fœdere conjuncta est. Non ergo baptizantur infantes, ut fiant sancti, sed quia sancti sunt, ideo baptizantur, id est, sigillum accipiunt. (p. 285.)

fulfilling its intended end and purpose in the members of the true Church of Christ; not supposing, apparently, that his words were likely to be construed as if they implied, that the full baptismal blessing is imparted, even in the case of infants, wherever the rite is administered.

"This spiritual resurrection is effected both sacramentally and really in baptism: sacramentally, through the external administration of the mystery; really, through the internal operation of the Holy Spirit. The Apostle has embraced both, Tit. iii. 5, 'According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.'"*

"In the administration itself of baptism Christians are consecrated to God; through the internal operation of the Spirit they are renewed after the Divine image: in respect of both they are called holy."†

Again, on the words, "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, &c.," he thus describes the benefits of baptism:—

"The spiritual benefits which are received in baptism; namely, the burial of the old man, which they are accustomed to call mortification; the resurrection of the new, which they call a quickening."‡

But then, proceeding to explain the words, "through the faith, &c." he adds,—

"We are now arrived at that instrument *by whose help and assistance the above-mentioned benefits of baptism are apprehended and possessed. For if this faith is wanting, although the treasures of grace are* OFFERED *in the Sacrament on the part of God, yet they are not* RECEIVED *on our part, but are driven away by our unbelief*. . . . It is not in vain that faith is required by the Apostle, that we may obtain the benefit of the spiritual resurrection. For as in the baptism of adults previous faith is required, according to the saying of our

* Hæc spiritualis resurrectio in baptismo et sacramentaliter et realiter efficitur; sacramentaliter, per externam mysterii administrationem; realiter, per internam Sancti Spiritus operationem. Utrumque complexus est Apostolus, Tit. iii. 5. 'Secundum suam misericordiam salvos nos fecit, per lavacrum regenerationis et renovationis Spiritus Sancti.' (Expos. Ep. Paul. ad Coloss. In c. 3. v. 1. Ed. 3. Cant. 1639. fol. p. 262.)

† In ipsa baptismi administratione Christiani Deo consecrantur; per Spiritus internam operationem ad Divinam imaginem reformantur; utroque respectu sancti vocantur. (Ib. ver. 12. p. 309.)

‡ Spiritualia beneficia quæ percipiuntur in baptismo; sepultura scilicet veteris hominis, quam appellare solent mortificationem; resuscitatio novi, quam vivificationem appellant. (Ib. p. 205.)

Saviour, Mar. xvi. 16, 'He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned;' so FROM THOSE WHO ARE BAPTIZED WHEN THEY ARE INFANTS, SUBSEQUENT FAITH IS REQUIRED; AND IF THEY DO NOT AFTERWARDS RENDER THIS, THEY RETAIN ONLY THE EXTERNAL SANCTIFICATION OF BAPTISM, THE INTERNAL EFFECTS OF SANCTIFICATION THEY HAVE NOT."*

And he adds here as a practical remark, under the head "usus,"—

"*Let us not,* WITH THE PAPISTS, *trust to the work wrought;* but let us further inquire whether we have all the other things without which the internal effects of baptism are not possessed."*

And proceeding subsequently to answer the objection of the Anabaptists, that if faith is required to render baptism efficacious, it ought not to be administered to infants, who cannot exercise faith, he shows in his reply how this doctrine of the necessity of faith is to be understood with respect to them, in these words,—

"If they speak of actual faith, of the actual desire and profession of mortification and vivification, we say that those passages of Scripture which require those things in the baptized must be restricted to adults: but as it respects infants, inasmuch as they are sinners not by their own act but by hereditary habit, it is sufficient that they have the mortification of sin and faith, not exerting themselves in their proper acts, but included in a habitual principle of grace. But no one in his senses will deny, that the Spirit of Christ can and is accustomed to produce in them this habitual principle of grace. *Further, it is not necessary that the Sacraments should work all that they represent in that very moment of time in which they are administered; nay, by*

---

* Perventum jam est ad instrumentum illud *cujus ope et adminiculo supra dicta baptismi beneficia apprehenduntur et possidentur. Si enim hæc fides desit, quamvis* OFFERANTUR *thesauri gratiæ in Sacramento ex parte Dei, non tamen* RECIPIUNTUR *ex parte nostra, sed repelluntur infidelitate* . . . Non frustra est quod fides exigitur ab Apostolo, ut beneficium spiritualis resurrectionis obtineamus. Nam ut in baptismo adultorum requiritur fides prævia, juxta dictum Salvatoris, Mar. xvi. 16. 'Qui crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit: qui non crediderit, condemnabitur:' SIC AB ILLIS QUI BAPTIZATI CUM JAM INFANTES SUNT, REQUIRITUR FIDES SUBSEQUENS; QUAM SI NON PRÆSTITERINT POSTEA, RETINENT EXTERNAM TANTUMMODO BAPTISMI SANCTIFICATIONEM, INTERNA SANCTIFICATIONIS EFFECTA NON HABENT. (Ib. pp. 207, 208.)

† *Ne operi operato fidamus* CUM PAPISTIS, sed inquiramus insuper an adsint nobis cætera omnia sine quibus interna baptismi effecta non habentur. (Ib. p. 208.)

the confession of the Schoolmen themselves, a covenant admitting of delay has place, when in the very act of making it there is an impediment in the way of the fulfilment of its conditions. Moreover in infants the very want of reason as far as concerns its exercise, is an impediment that prevents their having actual faith, or the actual desire of mortification."*

Here, then, are two ways mentioned in which the requisition of faith may be considered as applying to the case of infants; first, that a habitual principle of grace, comprehending faith seminally though not in act, may be given to infants by the Holy Spirit previous to baptism, qualifying them to derive an *immediate* salutary effect from it: which, he maintains, is, beyond doubt, often given: secondly, that where this does not take place, the salutary effect of baptism may be considered as delayed to a subsequent period,—that is, till the exercise of actual faith and repentance in the adult—for that it is not necessary to suppose that the Sacraments, even where efficacious, should effect all that they represent *at the very moment when they are administered*, the Schoolmen themselves conceding, that a covenant admitting of delay in the performance of its terms is admissible, when at the very undertaking of it there exists an impediment to their immediate fulfilment.

He maintains, then, that where grace has been previously conferred, there, and there only, the full baptismal blessing is immediately enjoyed; but in other cases this effect is delayed, till the period when by faith and repentance the party is qualified for its reception.

It appears, however, by another work of Bishop Davenant, that while he thus held that spiritual regeneration, in its full and

* Si loquantur de fide actuali, de actuali studio et professione mortificationis et vivificationis, illa Scripturæ loca quæ hæc requirunt in baptizatis, ad adultos esse restringenda dicimus: ad infantes autem quod attinet, quia peccatores sunt non proprio actu sed hæreditario habitu, sufficit quòd peccati mortificationem et fidem habeant, non proprio actu sese exerentem, sed in habituali principio gratiæ inclusam. Spiritum autem Christi principium hoc habituale gratiæ in illis efficere posse et solere nemo sanus negaverit. *Porrò*, non necesse est ut Sacramenta *eo ipso momento quo administrantur efficiant illa omnia quæ figurant; imo, concedentibus ipsis Scholasticis, pactio dilatoria locum habet, cum in ipsa susceptione obex ponitur.* Jam vero in infantibus ipse defectus rationis quoad actum, est impedimentum quò minus habere possint actualem fidem, vel actuale studium mortificationis. (Ib. 209.)

proper sense, is not bestowed at Baptism, except in the way and under the circumstances above described, he also held that the guilt of original sin is remitted to all the infants of believers when baptized, and consequently that there is *a sense* in which they may be called, *as infants*, regenerated, justified, and sanctified. That is, he maintains the view which I have noticed in the first Chapter, pp. 13, 14. His doctrine on this point is to be found in a Letter he addressed, when Bishop of Salisbury, (the precise date is not, I believe, known), to Dr. Ward, his successor in the Margaret Professorship, first published in 1650 in the work mentioned below.*

In this treatise (for such it may be called) he maintains the following among other propositions,—

"Protestants do not grant that justifying faith, or charity uniting to God, or regenerating grace, which renews all the faculties of the soul, are imparted to infants in the very moment of baptism."†

"The Fathers acknowledge neither actual nor habitual faith or charity to be given to little children in Baptism: they teach also that conversion, or the creation of a new heart, *which is properly to be called regeneration*, is not produced in them until they have reached an age capable of reason."‡

But,—

"All baptized infants are absolved from the guilt of original sin."§

And on this proposition he remarks, that infants may on this account be said to be, *as infants*, regenerated, justified, and adopted. And he thinks that this is what our Baptismal Service refers to.

Nevertheless,—

---

* Vindiciæ Gratiæ Sacramentalis duobus tractat. comprehensæ....Quibus præfigitur Epistola Rev. Patr. &c. Joann. Davenant....op. & stud. T[homæ] B[edford.] Lond. 1650. 12mo. It was reprinted, with strictures on it by T. Gataker. Lond. 1654. 8vo.

† Protestantes non concedunt fidem justificantem, aut charitatem Deo unientem, aut gratiam regeneratricem, quæ reparat omnes animæ facultates, in ipso Baptismi momento infundi infantibus. (p. 6.)

‡ Patres neque actualem neque habitualem fidem aut charitatem parvulis in Baptismo donatam agnoscunt: conversionem etiam sive novi cordis creationem, *quæ proprie Regeneratio dicenda est*, non nisi cùm ad ætatem rationis capacem pervenerint, in iis produci docent. (p. 8.)

§ Omnes infantes baptizati ab originalis peccati reatu absolvuntur. (p. 12.)

"The Justification, Regeneration, Adoption, which we grant to belong to baptized infants, is not identically the same with that Justification, Regeneration, and Adoption which, in the question concerning the Perseverance of the Saints, we have maintained is never lost."*

And on this proposition, he observes,—

"Nor is that *which is called* the Regeneration of a little child of the same kind with this new creation, or spiritual new-birth of adults, which we maintain to be never totally destroyed or lost, after that it has once been produced in the heart of a regenerate person by the power of the Spirit. It is commonly said, 'The same subject does not admit of several accidents of the same species.' But a Christian infant who is regenerated in Baptism, acquires another regeneration, when, as an adult, he gives credence to the Gospel. Therefore either he is twice regenerated, or this baptismal regeneration is not the same with that of adults, of which James says, 'Of his own will, &c.' (Ja. i. 18.) and Peter, 'Being born again, &c.' (1 Pet. i. 23.) and Paul, 'Put on, &c.' (Eph. iv. 24.)"†

And he adds, that those who perish,—

"Do not perish because they have lost *the sacramental regeneration suitable to the regeneration of little children;* but because they have never had that other regeneration from the seed of the word, and the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, which is *necessary to effect the regeneration of adults.*"‡

He maintains, therefore, that,—

"The Justification, Regeneration, and Adoption of little children

---

* Justificatio, Regeneratio, Adoptio quam concedimus competere infantibus baptizatis, non est univocè eadem cum illa justificatione, regeneratione, et adoptione, quam in quæstione de Perseverantia Sanctorum nunquam amitti defendimus. (p. 18.)

† Nec *quæ dicitur* Regeneratio parvuli est ejusdem speciei cum hac nova creatione, sive spirituali renascentia adultorum, quam defendimus nunquam totaliter aboleri aut amitti, postquam Spiritus virtute semel producta fuerit in corde regenerati. Vulgo dicitur, "non recipit idem subjectum plura accidentia ejusdem speciei." At infans Christianus qui regeneratus sit in Baptismo aliam regenerationem acquirit, cum adultus fidem adhibet Evangelio. Ergo aut bis regeneratur, aut regeneratio hæc baptismalis eadem non est cum illa adultorum, de qua Jacobus, "Voluntarie, &c." (Jac. i. 18.) Et Petrus, "Renati, &c." (1 Pet. i. 23.) Et Paulus, "Induite, &c." (Eph. iv. 24.) (p. 19.)

‡ Non pereunt, quòd amiserint *regenerationem sacramentalem parvulis regenerandis idoneam;* sed quòd nunquam habuerint regenerationem illam alteram ex semine verbi, et efficacia Spiritus Sancti, quæ *ad regenerationem adultorum efficiendam necessaria est.* (pp. 19, 20.)

baptized confers upon them a state of salvation ACCORDING TO THE CONDITION OF LITTLE CHILDREN."*

In commenting on this proposition, he remarks,—

"From these things any one may see, that infants by baptism are indeed placed in a state of salvation, but *only relatively to that age and condition of little children.* They therefore who perish in adult age, with their baptismal vow unfulfilled, do not lose the saving state which they possessed *according to the condition of little infants;* but they lose the infantine state, and when this is changed, *that which by the Divine appointment was sufficient for the salvation of the little child ceases to be sufficient for the salvation of the adult.*"†

Hence he adds the following proposition,—

"They who in Baptism, according to the common condition of little children, have been truly justified, regenerated, and adopted, are not, according to the special condition of adults, justified, regenerated, or adopted, when they arrive at the use of reason, unless by repenting, believing, renouncing, they fulfil the vow solemnly pronounced at baptism."‡

And he remarks on this,—

"For although as well in little children as in adults, justification, regeneration, and adoption imply acts of God; yet these Divine acts, so far as they relate to little children, do not require in them any precedent actions of free will: but in adults they do by Divine appointment require them to precede: *nor do they in little children imply those spiritual effects, with the absence of which in adults their justification, regeneration, and adoption can in no way consist.*"§

---

* Parvulorum baptizatorum Justificatio, Regeneratio, et Adoptio confert illis statum salutis PRO CONDITIONE PARVULORUM. (p. 25.)

† Ex hisce cuivis patere potest infantes per Baptismum poni quidem in statu salutis, sed *respectivè tantùm ad illam ætatem et conditionem parvulorum.* Qui igitur in adultiore ætate pereunt non impleto Baptismi voto, non amittunt statum salutiferum, quem habuerunt *pro conditione infantulorum;* sed amittunt statum infantilem, quo mutato, *cessat esse sufficiens ad salutem adulti, quod ex ordinatione divina sufficiens erat ad salutem parvuli.* (p. 27.)

‡ Qui in Baptismo pro communi conditione parvulorum verè justificati, regenerati et adoptati fuerunt, pro speciali conditione adultorum non existunt justificati, regenerati, aut adoptati, cùm ad usum rationis pervenerint, nisi pœnitendo, credendo, abrenuntiando, votum Baptismate nuncupatum impleverint. (pp. 27, 28.)

§ Nam licet tam in parvulis, quàm in adultis, justificatio, regeneratio, et adoptio innuant actus Dei: tamen hi actus divini, quatenus spectant parvulos, non requirunt in illis actiones aliquas præcedaneas liberi arbitrii: at in adultis ex ordinatione divina prærequirunt: NEQUE PONUNT IN PAR-

From these passages, then, it appears, that Bishop Davenant admitted, that all the infants of believers* have in baptism the pardon of original sin assured to them, so that in a certain sense they may be called regenerated by it; but that this regeneration is only a bare remission of sin, and is not that *spiritual regeneration* which is requisite for all adults to make them the children of God and members of Christ. As I have already observed, this view was not received by a large body of our early divines, who did not admit that even original sin was, necessarily and in all cases, pardoned in infants at their baptism. And it is admitted by Dr. Ward (as we shall see presently), though he agrees with Bishop Davenant's view, and perhaps carries it a little further, that "MOST *of our divines*" have held, that "ablution of infants from original sin [in baptism] is *only conditional* and *expectative*, of which they have no benefit till they believe and repent."†

This difference of view, however, among our divines, is comparatively of little moment. The great and all-important point to be contended for is, that an adult is not necessarily in a state of spiritual regeneration because he was baptized as an infant; that is, that such spiritual regeneration as is necessary for an adult is not always conferred upon infants when they are baptized. And this, as we see, Bishop Davenant holds as firmly as any other Protestant divine. Spiritual regeneration and justification are, by the doctrine of our Church as well as Holy Scripture, indissolubly connected, in adults, with faith. And where this truth is denied, the doctrine of justification by faith is plucked up by the roots. This we may clearly see in the remark of the Popish Bishop Gardiner respecting Cranmer's Homily on Justification, quoted above (p. 187), namely, that any such disquisition on the doctrine of Justification is quite unnecessary, in a Church where all are baptized as infants, "in which Sacrament of Baptism all we be justified before we can talk of this justification we strive for." Most justly, therefore, has Bishop

---

VULIS SPIRITUALIA ILLA EFFECTA, QUÆ IN ADULTIS SI MINUS PONANTUR, ILLORUM JUSTIFICATIO, REGENERATIO, ET ADOPTIO NULLO MODO POTEST CONSISTERE. (p. 28.)

* I say of "believers," because his other writings clearly show that he held such only to be proper subjects for baptism.

† Letter to Abp. Usher, among Usher's Letters, quoted more fully below.

Burnet, in his Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, described the doctrine of sacramental justification as one of the most pernicious errors of the Church of Rome.

Having thus gone through the testimonies that remain to us of the views of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Divinity Professors of our two Universities, up to, and even beyond, the middle of the reign of James I., I must request the reader to consider the weight of the testimony thus produced in determining the doctrine of our Church. The writers from whom I have been quoting, have not been taken at random, nor selected as the adherents of any particular school, but are the witnesses remaining to us of the views of that body of our divines, (namely, the succession of our Primates and the Divinity Professors of our Universities), to which any impartial person would probably at once look, as forming the most unexceptionable referees for the dominant theology of our Church in their day. What their evidence is, I leave the reader to determine for himself. And he must also recollect, how far the proofs given above, (in the third chapter,) of the *system of doctrine* held by those of whose sentiments on the *particular* subject of our present inquiry no testimony is to be found, show that *they also* maintained the same view as that taken by the writers just quoted.

I now proceed to the writings of other divines of the same period; many of them of equal celebrity; almost all, either Bishops, or holding high and important offices in our Church or Universities; and all of them clearly entitled to an influential voice in such an inquiry as that in which we are now engaged.

I give first a series of *the Bishops* of this period.

BISHOP GESTE, or GHEAST;

Bishop of Rochester from 1559 *to* 1571;—*and of Salisbury from* 1571 *to* 1576.

Bishop Geste is justly described, in the Life of him recently

published,* as having had the principal hand in preparing our present Book of Common Prayer, as arranged at the commencement of Queen Elizabeth's reign from the preceding Books revised and corrected. Any testimony, therefore, on our present subject, from such a quarter, is doubly valuable.

Now in his "Treatise against the private Masse,"† published in 1548, he distinctly adopts the view that the baptismal blessing is to be considered as given to infants that are themselves "faithful." For he says,—

"Christ, both God and man, with his Father and the Holy Ghost is present at the baptism of FAITHFUL infants, where they become embodied and incorporate thereto, it is to wete, where they eat his body and drink his blood as really as we do at his Supper."‡

Whether it is to be understood from this, that he agreed with Luther and his own contemporary Lancelot Ridley in supposing that infants have *actual* faith, and are to be considered as coming to baptism as *actual* believers, or whether he meant to refer to infants having a principle of Divine grace including the seed of faith implanted in them by God's gift, is a question of no moment. The doctrine involved in the statement, as far as concerns the subject of our present inquiry, is the same in both cases; and beyond all doubt clear enough.

In the same Treatise he also remarks,—

"The right usage of God's word and his Sacraments is recounted their due honour, as their abusion dishonour. The Word, Baptism and Absolution§ *through mean of true and obedient faith and cleansed conscience* be *condignly* and *accordingly received*, without either crouching or kneeling," &c. (p. 121.)

---

* The Life and Character of Edm. Geste. By H. G. Dugdale, Esq. Lond. 1840. 8vo. The Appendix of this work contains a reprint of his Remains.

† A Treatise againste the prevee Masse in the behalfe and furtheraunce of the mooste holye communyon .... 1548 .... imprinted .... by Thomas Raynold. 16mo.

‡ The Life and Character of Edm. Geste. Appendix, p. 116.

§ If these words should be considered as making Absolution a Sacrament, it must be remembered that the work was published in 1548, and that Cranmer himself published, in the same year, a Catechism in which it was so reckoned. The doctrine of our Church on that point has been settled since the period of these works.

But Bishop Geste, like the rest, when speaking *generally* of baptism, ascribes to it its appropriate effect. Thus he says,—"In baptism we put on Christ;" but his words in the immediate context show how much his meaning would be misrepresented, if this passage was taken to imply that *all* the baptized put on Christ. And the paragraph may be so useful in meeting some views now, alas, rife among us, that I will give the whole of it.

"Because it is thought sufficient to use but a surplice in baptizing, reading, preaching, and praying, therefore it is enough also for the celebrating of the communion. For if we should use another garment herein, it should seem to teach us, that higher and better things be given by it, than be given by the other service, *which we must not believe.* For in baptism we put on Christ. *In the word, we eat and drink Christ,* as Hierome and Gregory write."*

Such, then, as eat and drink Christ in the word, put on Christ in baptism.

BISHOP ALLEY;

Bishop of Exeter from 1560 *to* 1570.

In the year 1560 Bishop Alley read in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, "prælections" upon the first Epistle of St. Peter, which were first published in 1562, and again in a revised edition in 1571.

In this work he says,—

"It may be easily proved, that neither the preaching of the Gospel, nor receiving of the Sacraments, without faith, doth profit anything at all: for St. Paul saith, 'Sine fide impossibile est placere Deo.'"†

And it is remarkable that the whole of the preceding part of the paragraph from which these words are taken, describing the nature of a Sacrament, is translated *verbatim* from Bullinger's Decads. The first portion of it will be found at p. 968, and the latter at pp. 981, 982, of the English edition of the Decads above quoted. And, in fact, the passage just given, with the Scripture reference on which it is founded, and what follows to the end of

* Letter to Sir W. Cecil, sent with the Service Book. Ib. App. No. 4, p. 145.

† Ed. 1571. fol. 133.

the paragraph, are hardly more than an abridgment of Bullinger's remarks in the same place.

Moreover, understanding "the Church to be the company of true believers, those whom "God hath sanctified," and "in whom he dwelleth, being his holy and peculiar house,"* he thus defines it,—

"We may call *Ecclesiam*, the Church, a company of *them that believe*, and *them that are regenerate*, which God gathered in Christ by the word and the Holy Ghost.... It is called the body of Christ because *all his members take him for their head*, of whom they take their increasing, and do obtain life by the sending abroad of the Holy Ghost. *And these members are so fast joined to the head, that they be called flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones.*"†

Here is clearly a distinction between "the regenerate" and mere nominal Christians.

BISHOP COOPER;

Dean of Christ Church from 1567, *and of Gloucester from* 1569 *to* 1570;—*Bishop of Lincoln from* 1570 *to* 1583, *and of Winchester from* 1583 *to* 1594.

Bishop Cooper was one of the principal writers against the Puritans, and among the most learned divines of his day. In 1573 he published, in 4to.,

"A brief Exposition of such Chapters of the Old Testament as are usually read in the Church at Common Prayer on the Sunday." "There was an endeavour," Strype tells us, "that this book should be had in every parish church; and for the forwarding this, the Archbishop [Parker] gave his own testimonial to the Treasurer in June this year concerning the book; viz., 'That he thought it to be profitable for instruction, and necessary for the unlearned minister, but most to the poor subjects, who were certainly to be informed by *the stability of this doctrine*. And therefore he desired his Lordship to signify the same unto her Majesty's Council, that they might give some commendation thereunto; which he supposed would do well.'"‡

* Fol. 145, and see fol. 186, 187, &c.
† Fol. 147.
‡ Life of Parker, ii. 367. Oxf. ed.

In this work, commenting on Jer. v. 2, 3, he says,—

"This place ought to teach us, that the name of the Church, or People of God, the title of Christians, *the external Sacraments of Christian religion*, are not sufficient *to move the favour of God toward us*, nor *to make us his people*, unless the fear of God and true holiness be in our hearts." (fol. 281.)

But in 1580 he published a volume of Sermons,* in which the subject of the Sacraments is treated at some length.

In the second Sermon, giving a brief view of the "fruitful doctrine of *the Protestants* concerning baptism," he says;—

"As touching baptism, we teach not only, as some falsely father upon us, that it is *signum initiale*, a sign whereby we be first consecrated Christians; but we add also, that we *by faith*, and the operation of the Holy Ghost, do put on Christ as a garment, that is, that we have him so fastened and appropriated to us, that he is ours, and we his, and that he hideth and covereth our nakedness, according as S. Paul saith: 'As many as are baptized, have put on Christ.' We believe and teach, that Baptism is to Christians the fountain of life, whereby our sins are washed away.... [referring to Acts ii. 38, and xxii. 16.] Yet do we not attribute the operation hereof to the water or outward element, but to the might of God's word, and the power of the Holy Ghost, WORKING BY FAITH, as Augustine saith, 'Quomodo fit quod aqua corpus tangat, et cor abluat, nisi faciente verbo, non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur:' *i. e.* 'How cometh it to pass, that water toucheth the body and washeth the soul, but by the working of the word, not because it is spoken, but because it is believed.' Where it is to be noted, that it is not the sound of the words, uttered in the way of a charm by the minister, but *the words believed in the hearts of the faithful, that maketh the promise of Christ and effect of the Sacrament to be fruitful to the receiver*. We believe moreover and teach, that the Sacrament of baptism is, as it were, the womb of the Church of Christ, where we are new born, and become of the children of wrath the children of God, and are prepared by this our second birth to enter into the kingdom of God. [He refers here to John iii. 5, and Tit. iii. 5.] We believe also and teach as touching this Sacrament, that not only we, but our seed also, hath by it the benefit of salvation, and therefore do we defend the baptizing of our children, against the wicked heresy of the Anabaptists. They which consider these things simply, and with a charitable Christian mind, I trust will

* Certain Sermons wherein is contained the Defence of the Gospel now preached, &c. Lond. 1580. 4to.

clear us of that odious report wherewith our adversaries slanderously do burthen us, as though we contemned the Sacraments, and slightly taught the fruits and benefits of them. Now, on the contrary part, let us consider how corruptly the Church of Rome teacheth, as touching this Sacrament, and how horribly they have abused it. First, they teach, that baptism doth confer grace and wash away our sins, *ex opere operato*, that is, even by the very washing only of the water, though there be no good motion of faith or belief in the heart of him that is baptized." (pp. 30, 31.)

And speaking of "what fruits have followed the preaching of the Gospel," he reckons among them,—

"That sundry points of doctrine be reformed. . . . principally, the wholesome doctrine of the grace and merit of Christ, of remission of sins, of eternal life, *received by faith in Christ*, and *sealed* and *confirmed* by his *Sacraments*." (p. 113.)

Treating more fully of the Sacraments in another Sermon, he thus defines the word "Sacrament":—

"A sacrament is a reverend and holy mystery ordained of God, wherein he by his holy word and promise, doth both stir up and practise the faith of his people, and by the operation of the Holy Ghost increase his grace in them, and bestow his benefits and blessings upon them; and we on the other part testify our obedience toward him, and unity of faith among ourselves." (p. 118.)

But,—

"*Indeed the hand of the receiver, being without faith, maketh the Sacraments, that of themselves be good, to be unto him of no force, because of his unbelief.*" (p. 119.)

"*By faith we be graffed into Christ*, as branches into the root and stock, so that we live now by him and by his Spirit, as the branches do by the juice that cometh from the body of the tree. By faith we be so united unto Christ, that we may justly say, whatsoever is his, is ours also: *by faith we are made the children of God and heirs of eternal life.*" (p. 146.)

"Some perchance will say unto me, or will think with themselves in their mind: If this doctrine be true, then are Sacraments needless. For we may eat Christ by faith, spiritually, in such sort as you have said, without any use of the Lord's Supper, [this passage occurs in a Sermon on the Lord's Supper,] and therefore it may seem superfluous. God forbid that the most perfect Christians and of strongest faith, should once think Sacraments to be superfluous and needless.

They be the blessed and holy ordinances of Christ, by his mercy and goodness appointed for our great help and benefit, as I have in the former Sermon [which is on *the two* Sacraments] declared. And yet I must confess to the great comfort of many godly persons, that the faithful Christian may, and doth often feed upon Christ to salvation, beside the use of the Sacrament. For the spiritual grace and benefits, which as I have said before is the principal part of a Sacrament, is not of necessity always so tied to the outward signs, that without them God cannot or doth not sometime bestow the same. I doubt not but the thief upon the cross without use of the Sacrament did eat the body and blood of Christ in such sort, that he was the same day with him in Paradise. (Luke xxiii. 41.) We see in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts x.) that Cornelius and his company were sealed with the Spirit of God, before the receiving of the outward Sacrament, in such sort, that if he had then immediately departed out of this life, he should have gone to heaven, which could not be, unless he had spiritually by faith eaten the true food of everlasting life, that is, Christ Jesus crucified, *which he fed upon most assuredly while he heard St. Peter preach Christ*." (pp. 147, 148.)

Here, though his especial subject is the Lord's Supper, he puts both Sacraments together, as being both ordinances of precisely the same nature. And this, with several other passages in the context, may illustrate the phraseology of the Twenty-fifth Article, where one sentence may seem only to apply to one Sacrament, while the next uses the word Sacraments in the plural number, and therefore was intended to apply to both, the subject of the Article being the two Sacraments.

Again, he says:—

"The word of God teacheth that Sacraments are, as it were, seals to confirm the truth of God's promises, and to strength [strengthen] our faith. . . . The Scriptures teach that in the use of the Sacraments *through faith*, we be united unto Christ, and ingraffed into his mystical body, so that we live now only by him, and whatsoever is his, by the truth of his promise, is ours also." (p. 151.)

But with this doctrine he is careful to connect that of the efficacy of the Sacraments in the case of a right reception of them. Thus he says:

"Wherefore the especial and principal part of the Sacrament is the spiritual and internal thing, as in baptism (as I have said), regeneration and sanctification." (p. 122.)

"We teach and believe that these spiritual effects are as certainly wrought by the Holy Ghost in the Sacraments, as we see that the external elements have their operation in the course of nature. For the Sacraments are as the deeds and seals of Almighty God, whereby he doth in deed and verily, not only by signification, but effectually, convey unto us the possession of his spiritual blessings." (p. 123.)

"The right use and understanding of the Sacraments .... teacheth us, that in Baptism we are all new born, children of God and graffed into one body." (p. 127.)

"You hear us teach, and as you love the salvation of your souls, require you to believe, that they [the Sacraments] be signs and figures indeed, but such as most assuredly bring *unto the faithful heart*, verily and in truth, the self-same things that they signify; so that the *faithful* Christian receiver may assure himself, that as truly as God is God, so truly he receiveth those things which the outward Sacrament doth signify." (p. 128.)

And then, in the immediate context, he explains the meaning of this language in these words:—

"*When we speak therefore of the Sacrament, we must speak* AS IT IS IN ITSELF, *by the force of God's word, consisting of all three parts,* [*i. e.* the outward sign, the invisible grace, and 'the word of Christ's institution and promise,'] *and not as the boldness of men, or* THE WEAKNESS AND IMPERFECTION OF OUR FAITH MAY MAKE IT UNTO US." (p. 128.)

Here is the explanation of all such passages as speak in general terms of the value and force of the Sacraments. They speak of them as they are when their full effects and purpose are realized. They were intended by God to convey a spiritual blessing, an invisible grace. But the faithlessness of man may make them a mere external rite. To the true believer baptism is effectual for his incorporation into the *true* (as distinguished from the nominal) Church of Christ, whether it wrought this effect precisely at the period when it was bestowed, or at some subsequent time. To the unbeliever it produces no such effect.

BISHOP BABINGTON;

Bishop of Llandaff from 1591 *to* 1594;—*of Exeter from* 1594 *to* 1597;—*and of Worcester from* 1597 *to* 1610.

In his "Notes on Genesis," first published in 1592, he says:—

"That the child was not circumcised before the eighth day, it teacheth us that God hath not tied salvation to the Sacrament, for it had been a hard thing in the Lord to defer it an hour if the child had perished without it. This answereth the fear of some good ones, and the false boldness of some bad ones, in these days, touching children that die without baptism, for God is not worse to us under the Gospel, than he was to them under the Law; neither less able to save now without baptism, than in those days he was without circumcision, the seed of the faithful. This grace was not then free and now bound, then more and now less, then stronger and now weaker; far be it from us so to dream. David's child, when it died before the eighth day, he yet for all that judged not damned, neither cried out for it as he did for Absalom that was circumcised, but said that he should go to it, refreshed himself, cheered his wife, and made his servants to wonder at his comfort. And when he said he should go to it, we know that he meant not that it was in hell, or any hellish Limbus, and that thither himself looked to go to it, but rather comfortably he conceived it was with the Lord, because the promise extended itself both to the godly and to their seed. If further we desire to think of this matter, consider we this and the like reasons. No elect can be damned, we know it a principle, whatsoever foolish men do prattle: but some unbaptized are elect (a thing that no man will deny), therefore some unbaptized cannot be damned: which if it be true, then see you plainly that salvation is not tied to baptism, as some imagine. Again, 'he that heareth my word,' saith Christ, 'and believeth in him that sent me, shall be saved,' cannot be damned, (John v. 24): but this may one do before he be baptized: therefore, before a man be baptized, he may stand in the state of salvation, and out of all danger of damnation. The assumption is evident in the eunuch (Acts viii.) and others ..... *Are covenants made by sacraments, or only sealed by them?* Did not the primitive Church examine those of years in the faith before they baptized them? Why so, I pray you, but that they might shew it was *the covenant, not the seal, their faith and not the sacrament, which chiefly was to be regarded,* though the seal also in no case to be neglected, much less contemned. How many in times past deferred their baptism for many years, as Constantine, Nazianzen, &c., not therein doing so well as they ought, but yet evidently showing the faith of the Church then, that God without baptism is able to save, and hath not tied his grace to any sign."*

* Works of Bishop Babington, 1622. fol. Notes upon Genesis, p. 53.

And in another work, entitled "An Exposition of the Catholic Faith; or, The Twelve Articles of the Apostles' Creed Expounded, &c.," he clearly limits the gift of regeneration to a *portion* of the visible Church. Commenting on the Ninth Article, which he thus delivers, "I believe the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints," he remarks :—

"For the sense and meaning, it is as if I should say, I believe that God ever hath had, ever hath, and ever shall have to the end of the world, a certain flock gathered of all sorts of men, and *chosen by him to eternal life*, which by his Holy Spirit and Word, *agreeing in true faith*, he gathereth, defendeth, and preserveth; and I believe that of this Church I am a true living member, and by his grace shall ever so remain. . . . [And citing John x. 16, and Rom. xii. 5, he says] Both these Scriptures and the former title in the Creed [*i. e.* 'Holy Catholic Church'] are to be understood not of the visible, but of *the invisible Church of the elect alone*, which indeed is called the Body of Christ, because most nearly it is joined to Christ her Head. It is called the Spouse of Christ, because it is loved of him, and because by a spiritual matrimony Christ hath joined himself to her. It is called the Sheepfold of Christ, because it heareth his voice. *And when you speak of a note or mark to know the Church by, you must understand the visible Church consisting not of elect alone, but mixed with elect and reprobate together.* . . . The Church is holy, 'quia accepit gratiam sanctitatis, gratiam Baptismi et remissionis peccatorum' (August. in Ps. 85): 'Because she hath received the grace of holiness, the grace of Baptism, and the forgiveness of sins.' After this sort, I believe there is no death, no sin in the Church, because such as believe in Christ are not sinners, are not guilty of death, but just and holy, and lords over both sin and death in Christ, appointed and assured of eternal life. *But this holiness hitherto spoken of is a note of the invisible Church, and therefore cannot be applied to the visible, in which, though there be many that live holily, yet there be many goats mingled, and holiness is known only to God.*"*

And in his comment on the next Article, "I believe the forgiveness of sins," he expressly says :—

"To whom doth God grant this mercy? *To all the company of his elect, and to them only.* So saith the Scripture;—the people that dwell therein, that is, in the Church,—and so consequently are

* Works; Expos. of the Catholic Faith, pp. 227, 228, 232.

his sheep, and of his fold,—they, they shall have their sins forgiven." (Is. xxxiii. 24.)*

But still, precisely according to the language of our Liturgy and Catechism, he held that one who professed himself to be a true believer ought to consider himself as one to whom this mercy has been granted, for he says :—

"Now see the comfort of the Article. I believe the forgiveness of sins, that is, even of my sins, my sins, my sins, must every man say. For to believe other men's to be pardoned, and not mine, is, not to believe the Article."†

And in his "Exposition on the Lord's Prayer," first published in 1588, he thus describes "regeneration :"—

"We are by nature the children of wrath, walking after the Prince that ruleth in the air, that is, the devil. But the Lord is gracious, his mercy endureth for ever: there remaineth therefore hope by a restitution or regeneration, which the Scripture teacheth us thus much of: namely, That whereas Satan abuseth that corrupt nature of ours through the great power which he hath over us for our sins, and driveth us from the word and all religion into all blindness, ignorance, and errors; thrusteth us into divers miseries and calamities, and in the end into eternal death, there being, where he rul th, no true love of God or any grace, but sinning, without sting, touch, or feeling: the Lord our God in a contrary course of love, WHERE IT PLEASETH HIM, beginneth with that corruption of nature whereby Satan before was strong, and taketh it away by little and little, *begetting us anew to a better life*, and restoring that image of his in us again, whereunto we were first created, and which so fearfully we were fallen from. Our mind he illuminateth with some heavenly light, whereby it beginneth to know aright God, and by grace our will receiveth a new strength to embrace the word, to rest in it, and to incline itself to the testimonies of the Lord. Our heart is purged and loveth the Lord, and all the members of the body, before the weapons of unrighteousness unto sin, become by measure the weapons of righteousness unto God. So sin dieth, grace liveth, and we love him, fear him, trust in him, pray to him often, and in all our wants, with such like."‡

Such is his account of "regeneration." Neither is there

* Ib. p. 249. † Ib. p. 249.
‡ Works; Expos. of Lord's Prayer, pp. 140, 141.

any notice of baptism in it, nor does the description agree with any universal effect produced by Infant baptism.

BISHOP JOHN BRIDGES;

Dean of Salisbury from 1577 *to* 1603, *and Bishop of Oxford from* 1603 *to* 1618.

The work from which the following extracts are taken, entitled, "Defence of the Government Established in the Church of England," was written by Bishop Bridges, when Dean of Salisbury, in defence of the Church against the Puritans.

"Is it not then of sufficient virtue to baptize and cleanse the infant, when besides the element of water, these words, In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that Christ hath commanded those to use, which are his ministers appointed thereunto, besides the promise there declared of washing away our sins, of newness of life, and that we shall be saved: which promise, WHERE *God's spirit worketh by his word*, is annexed to the element, —is not all this sufficient and effectual to baptize an infant, except a sermon also hereof be made at his baptism?" (Defence of Government Estab. in Ch. of Engl. Lond. 1587. 4to. p. 564.)

To the objection of his opponents, that the Church, in saying that baptism was to be ministered in private places, "only in case of necessity," seemed to make baptism absolutely necessary to salvation, he replies thus,—

"What do our brethren here mean? That there is no necessity at all of baptism, although there be no such necessity? Is there no necessity of consequence, of condition, nor of conveniency, as well as absolute, simple, and inevitable necessity? If, generally, there were no necessity at all of baptizing, then it were free, whether we would be baptized or no. But it is not free. Christ did institute baptism under flat commandment. Therefore there is a necessity, and an important necessity of it. Did not baptism succeed circumcision? As Paul clearly setteth out, Col. ii. 11 and 12. In whom also ye are circumcised (saith he) &c. And was there no necessity at all of circumcision? We grant this necessity was not so absolute, that it reached to them before their time assigned; no, nor yet after, was it so absolute necessity, that it reached to them while they travelled in the wilderness, God dispensing (for other manifold necessities) in

that long journey with the necessity of that sacrament. And yet God's commandment remaining entire: and they with such a necessity severely bound, that they should not *contemn* on their parts the obedience and execution of it. And therefore saith Zanchius in this *very well*, in his confession of Christian Religion, concerning baptism, Cap. 15, Aphor. 5. 'We believe that baptism is altogether necessary in the Church, as a sacrament instituted of Christ, and which the Church can so little want, that where it is not, when it may be had, there we may not acknowledge the Church of Christ. Howbeit we think it needful unto salvation in this wise; that notwithstanding, if any, for the default of the minister, but not through contempt, depart this life not sprinkled with the water, we believe not that he is therefore damned, and wrapped in eternal destruction. For *the children of the faithful are therefore saved, because they are in the covenant;* but they that be of ripe years, because they believe in Christ with a true faith, which verily cannot suffer the contempt of Christ's commandment.'"

And having proceeded to give some further quotations and remarks, Dr. Bridges concludes thus,—

"Neither do we urge this absolute, simple, and inevitable necessity of any of both the Sacraments themselves. Save in general, that they must needs be had in the Church (as Zanchius said), not only as necessary tokens and demonstrances of the true Churches, but also as God's *seals ordained for the confirmation of our faith*, and such parts of his covenant with us and ours with him, as the whole Church is bound to have and use. But when it comes to the particular use and application, we do not so necessarily tie them to this or that person of or in the Church, that if they have them not, be it not by their own default, the want of them may endanger their salvation: *the virtue whereof depends not upon any Sacrament, or is included in it.*" (Ib. pp. 578, 579, and 587. See more, pp. 589, 590.)

A little further on, he speaks of,—

The Pope's "MANIFOLD AND HORRIBLE ERRORS OF DOCTRINE CONCERNING BAPTISM." (Ib. 588.)

And his opponent having said, that the necessity of baptism, intimated by the Church, "is nothing else but to affirm with the Papist, that Sacraments confer grace of the work wrought, and that the Sacrament of baptism is a Sacrament of such necessity, that whosoever is not dipped in water must be eternally condemned," he replies,—

"This opinion of the Papists, as they now obstinately maintain the same, is, I grant, *heretical*." (Ib. p. 590.)

And then he adds, in answer to the doctrine of his opponents as to the *necessity* of a *preacher* to administer baptism,—

"Will not this *heretical opinion* of the Papists go near to creep in after, of *opus operatum*, while we stand so necessarily on *opus operantis?*" (Ib. p. 594.)

And in another passage he distinctly maintains (though incidentally, while treating on another point) Calvin's doctrine on the subject. He is replying to the statement of his opponents pronouncing all to be lost that have not faith, and he remarks that this is too unlimited a statement, observing,—

"If there be no way of salvation but by faith, how well might we then cry out indeed, O Lord, how miserable is the state of all our infants, dying not only before, but also after baptism in their infancy. The Papists, as they pronounce that none are saved, but only such as are baptized, so, for faith likewise, they hold this opinion, that there is no way of salvation but by faith, albeit, adding other things thereto, and seeing their infants not capable of faith, they affirm that they are saved, not by their own faith, but by the Church's faith, and by the faith of their Godfathers and Godmothers (as we call them), that in baptizing undertake and answer for them.

"Luther and divers other following him, perceiving the grossness of this error (upon which sundry inconveniences depend), to be saved by the faith, not of himself, but of other, affirm that our infants have theirselves the substance of faith, although it be not able in act to show itself: and that (as Saint Paul saith out of Abakuk, ca. 2, The just liveth by his own faith), they are *likewise saved and justified by their own faith.*

"*But Calvin, seeing further into this matter*, and that this properly and in very deed is not faith, which requireth both an intellectual knowledge and an actual assured persuasion and confidence on the truth of God's promises and covenant in the mercies and merits of Christ Jesus, which act of the mind infants have not; and considering that *salvation properly dependeth not on the act or on the habit of our faith, but on* GOD'S ETERNAL ELECTION, *and the performance of his promise;* and that faith being the gift of God, is indeed the only means and way of salvation to those that are capable to understand, and, by believing the same, apply the promise of Christ his merits and salvation to themselves, but *unto those that are not yet grown to this capacity*, their natural defect, or rather unripeness, maketh not the promise of God frustrate, nor DEFEATETH THE ELECTION, THAT WAS

BEFORE THE CHILDREN WERE BORN, *yea, ere the foundations of the world were laid, purposed in God's eternal decree, and this foundation is sure, God knows who are his*;—Calvin therefore willeth us, not to apply these sentences of Christ (that recommend faith unto us) unto the infants: but unto those that are grown to capacity, by the gift of God in them, to understand and apprehend the same. And for the infants of us which are faithful, and so included in the covenant betwixt God and his people, admitting our infants to receive the Sacrament of regeneration, because, though they be not capable of knowledge and faith, yet are they *capable of the thing signified*, and of the favour of God the Father, and of the grace of Christ the Son, and of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; yea, although they die before they receive *the outward sign*, yet not to presume to judge them clean debarred and bereft of these inward graces, but to rely upon the promise of the covenant, that he will not only be our God, and so our Saviour, that have faith in him, but the God and Saviour of our seed also, although yet they have not faith in him, and that we and our seed shall be his people. Neither only in an outward sanctification, whereby as the root, so the branches are holy; but *by the inward sanctification and by salvation*, SO FAR AS ACCORDETH WITH HIS ETERNAL ELECTION IN CHRIST JESU." (Ib. pp. 482, 483.)

Here then we see plainly that in the opinion of Bishop Bridges, the gift of the baptismal grace depends upon the previous divine "election" of the child to salvation.

And I would just add, that while he denies that infants can have *actual* faith, he holds at the same time that such infants have "the seed of faith" in them, as appears from the following words,—

"In some respects, the Sacrament itself is more principal than is the preaching of it. As in baptism, to incorporate the infant into the Church of Christ, which infant is not properly as yet faithful, though he be the seed of the faithful, *and have (as Beza calleth it) the seed of faith, but not faith, in him*." (Ib. p. 594.)

BISHOP WILLIAM BARLOW;

Bishop of Rochester from 1605 *to* 1608, *and of Lincoln from* 1608 *to* 1613. *He had previously been Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth and to Archbishop Whitgift, a Prebendary of St. Paul's, then of Westminster, and then of Canterbury, and Dean of Chester.*

The following extracts are from his "Defence of the Articles

of the Protestants' Religion," published in 1601, in reply to a work written by a Papist.

The Papist brings the following charge (among others) against the doctrine of the Protestants :—

"The 3. Article is *Remission of Sins*, for they acknowledge no such effect in the Sacrament of Baptism, but only account it as [an] external sign of a præ-received grace or favour of God, by his eternal prædestination, against the express word of God : which therefore calleth the Sacrament the *laver of regeneration* (Tit. iii.), for that in it the soul dead by sin, is newly regenerated by grace."

To this Barlow, after complaining of the misrepresentation here made of the doctrine of the Protestants, replies thus ;—

"The consent of our Church is, that Baptism is *the indument of Christ*, Gal. iii. : an insition into Christ, Rom. vi. : as the ark of Noe, in the deluge, to save us, 1 Pet. iii. : the laver of regeneration to wash us, Tit. iii. : working a double effect, privately *remissa culpa* in washing us ; positively *data justitia* in sanctifying us, 1 Cor. vi. 11 : whether we use it as the water of Jordan by immersion, Matt. iii., or as the holy water in the law by aspersion, Numb. xix. : not regarding the heathenish distinction, between diving and sprinkling in Macrob. (Sat. iii. c. 1.), and therefore with Clemens Alexandrinus we account it φαρμακον παιονιον, the sovereign counterpoison against original *venom ;* with Nazianzen, the deluge of sin ; with Basil, the mother of adoption ; with Chrysostom, the purgatory of life ; Ezechiel his *aqua munda*, cleansing us from all our pollutions, Ezech. xxxvi. Notwithstanding, we ascribe not this power either *ad elementum* or *momentum ;* not to the element of water, as though it had *vim ablutivam*, as Aquine speaketh, this scouring force ; or *regenerativam*, this renewing power, as Lombard terms it ; but unto the blood of Christ working invisibly by the power of the Spirit, Tit. iii. *Non enim aqua lavat animam, sed ipsa prius lavatur a Spiritu, ut lavare possit spiritualiter*, saith Jerome. Hereupon the Fathers resemble it to the diving pool of Bethesda, John v. ; as that being moved by the Angel had an healing power, so this consecrated by the word and sanctified by the Spirit, hath a sovereign effect and operation ; and for that purpose, sometimes they call the water in baptism *rubram aquam*, red water, the blood of Christ, having there his invisible working.

"*Why ? but the Protestants account it* only *an external seal of a pre-received grace in God's predestination.* [This is a quotation from his opponent's charge, and he answers] He names none, yet Campian,

whose ape he is, quotes Calvin, (Rat. 8.) but cites him not; Duræus cites him (Contra Whit. lib. 8), but understands him not; that word *only* is not the first lie he hath coined. . . . The first fruit, which Master Calvin, among these principal effects, noteth (Institut. lib. 4.) in this Sacrament is, that it is *symbolum nostræ purgationis*, the very words of the Greek Scholiast in 1 Pet. iii. συμβολικως παριστησιν απολυσιν· yea of Pighius, a gross Papist, *Baptismus a peccatis ablutionis signum est; et instar signati diplomatis*, saith Calvin, and as the King's letters patent under seal confirmeth our commission: that *as a prince, having purposed a favour to his subjects, grants it by his patents of mere indulgence, and ratifies it by his seal for more assurance; so God* HAVING PURPOSED IN HIS ETERNAL COUNSEL TO SAVE SOME, *which he cannot do before he has remitted their sins, therefore in Baptism he both confers this grace and confirms it* UNTO THEM; for which cause the Scriptures and Fathers do call it *sigillum promissionis et remissionis;—confers* it, I say, as Campian (ubi sup.) confesseth it, *veluti per canalem*, derivatively, not originally; effectually, not effectively; as by a brook not as from a spring; for this is Christ's blood, *quia latus Christi est latex sacramenti*, saith S. Austin: as Allen the Cardinal speaketh (De sacra. chap. 3.), grace is wrought in baptism as a man writeth with a pen, powerfully, yet instrumentally;—*confirms* it visibly, sealing that which [is] concealed. So, that which was in his secret counsel, *propositum*, the purpose of his will by predestination, in Baptism he makes it *depositum*, the pledge of our salvation, and ONLY TO THE ELECT; for, *in solis electis sacramenta efficiunt quod figurant*, saith S. Augustine, in the elect only the sacraments perform really, which they present figuratively: (Aug. de bap. contra Donat. et citat. a Lomb. lib. 4. dist. 4.)* *and therefore that is no heresy nor fancy to call it* THE SEAL OF A PRÆ-RECEIVED GRACE. For justification by faith, which oftentimes, in those which are *adulti*, prevents Baptism, is *a præ accepted grace*, and cannot stand without a perfect remission of their sins which are so justified. What fruit then brings Baptism to them? even this, saith Lombard (ubi sup. F.); because he who thus justified cometh to baptism, is as the branch brought by the dove into Noe his ark, Gen. 8. *qui ante intus erat judicio Dei, sed nunc etiam judicio Ecclesiæ*, who before was justified, and fully remitted in God's secret judgment, but now by baptism is made a visible member of the Church, the sacrament being the evidence of God's providence, and this was Cornelius his case, Acts 10. Also we urge (Bilson, lib. 4. contr. Apol. Jesuit.) the necessity of baptism, especially to infants, lest they should seem either naturally innocent, or generally

* The *citation* here may be inaccurate, but of course this does not affect the question of Barlow's doctrine, as maintained throughout the passage.

sanctified without it; yet not simply, but with a reservation, first, of God's omnipotency, who being *agens liberrimum*, as the schoolmen speak, hath not tied his power to the Sacraments, saith Lombard (ubi sup.); secondly, of pre-eminence to Christ's baptism, wherein not he, but we were washed, the waters drenching him, but cleansing us: which made S. Augustine to cry out *O misericordia*, O the mercy and withall the power of God, *Necdum eramus in mundo, et jam abluebamur in Baptismo.* (August. de temp. serm. 30.) Thirdly, with a dispensation of that which the schoolmen call *articulum necessitatis*, there being no contempt of religion, but either extremity disappointing, or death suddenly preventing, as infants, and the thief crucified, Luke 23. Fourthly, with a distinction of *Baptismus voti*, when there is a will in the parties, but no opportunity for the action, *volentes non valentes* saith Lombard, as in the case of Valentinian in S. Ambrose. (Ambros. orat. funeb. Valentin.) Briefly, *we so highly extol the dignity, necessity, and efficacy of Baptism, that Duræus pleaseth himself triumphantly, in hope that some of our writers are proved, in this opinion, Romanists,* saving he misliketh our detestation of that magical conceit of *opus operatum*, videlicet, that the very act of Baptism, without either the parties faith, or the Spirit's power, should confirm grace of itself. (Duræus De Paradox. contr. Whitak.)."*

Here again we see that the strongest terms may be used as to the benefit of baptism, where nevertheless they are understood as applicable only in those cases where God has a purpose of mercy to accomplish in the recipient of baptism; where in fact there is a "præ-received grace;" and that Duræus the Romanist "pleased himself triumphantly" in those times, as some are inclined to triumph *in these times*, in misinterpreting such phrases as intended to express the Romish doctrine of Baptism.

And it is observable, that the Popish writer here replied to, while he draws a distinction between the general body of the Protestants of the Church of England and "the Puritans," ascribing *three* errors respecting the Creed to *both* these parties, and *two more* to the *latter*, puts down this error (as he calls it) respecting baptism among the *three* held by *both*.

---

* A Defence of the Articles of the Protestants' Religion, in answer to a libel lately cast abroad, entitled, Certain Articles, or forcible reasons, discovering the palpable absurdities, and most intricate errors of the Protestants' Religion. Lond. 1601, 4to. pp. 141—147.

I may here add, that this work is dated by Barlow from Lambeth Palace (he being then one of Archbishop Whitgift's chaplains), and *dedicated by him to Dr. Bancroft*, then Bishop of London, and afterwards Whitgift's successor at Canterbury.

BISHOP LANCELOT ANDREWS;

Bishop of Chichester from 1605 *to* 1609; *of Ely from* 1609 *to* 1618; *and of Winchester from* 1618 *to* 1626.

Bishop Andrews, though not *precisely* of the same sentiments as the great body of his predecessors and contemporaries in our Church, on the subject of Predestination and its kindred points, is yet another witness against the doctrine that spiritual regeneration is always conferred upon all infants in baptism. And I need not say a word to prove that his testimony is one entitled to great respect.

In his Sermons, "Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost," we find the following passages:—

"Howsoever it be, if these three, Prayer, the Word, the Sacraments, be every one of them as an artery to convey the Spirit into us, well may we hope, if we use them all three, we shall be in a good way to speed of our desires. For, many times we miss, when we use this one, or that one, alone; where it may well be, God hath appointed to give it us by neither, but by the third. It is not for us to limit or appoint him, how, or by what way, He shall come unto us and visit us: but to offer up our obedience, in using them all. (Serm. 1.)*

Again;—

"Take Christ as a purchaser: the purchase is made, the price is paid; yet is not the state perfect, unless there be investiture, or (as we call it) liverie and seisin: that maketh it complete. *Perquisitio*, that very word is Christ's: but the investiture is by the Spirit, 2 Cor. v. 5. If we come not, we lack that: that, we may not lack, and so not lack him. What will ye, that I say? Unless we be joined to him, as well as he to us—as he to us, by our flesh, so we to him, by his Spirit—nothing is done. The exchange is not perfect, unless, as

* Ninety-six Sermons by L. Andrews, late Bishop of Winchester. 2nd. ed. Lond. 1632. fol. p. 607.

he taketh our flesh, so he give us his Spirit: as he carrieth up that to heaven, so he send this down into earth. Ye know, it is the first question the Apostle asked: 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?' (Acts xix. 2.) If not, all else is to no purpose: without it, we are still (as Jude calleth us) 'animales, Spiritum non habentes,' natural men, but without the Spirit. (Jude, ver. 19.) And this is a certain rule, 'Qui non habet,' he that hath not his Spirit is none of his; Christ profiteth him nothing. (Rom. viii. 9.) Shall I let you see one inconvenience more, of 'non veniet?' As nothing is done for us, so nothing can be done by us, if he come not. No means on our part avail us ought. *Not Baptism; for, 'nisi ex Spiritu,' if he come not, well may it wash soil from our skin, but no stain from our soul: no 'laver of regeneration,' without 'renewing of the Holy Ghost.'* No Preaching, neither; for, that is but 'a letter that killeth,' except the Spirit come too and quicken it. (2 Cor. iii. 6.) No Sacrament; we have a plain text for it: The 'flesh profiteth nothing,' if 'the Lord and giver of life' (the Spirit) be away. (John vi. 63.) To conclude, no Prayer; for 'nisi,' unless 'the Spirit help our infirmity,' and 'make intercession with us,' we neither know how, nor what to pray. (Rom. viii. 26.) So, the Spirit must come to all: and it goeth through; neither can ought be done for us, or by us, without it." (Serm. 4.)*

Again, in words which clearly shew the meaning of passages that might at first sight, and separated from other statements of the same author, be taken as having an opposite meaning:—

"A third necessity there is, we receive him: for that, with him, we shall receive whatever we want, or need to receive, for our souls' good. And here fall in all his offices. By Him, we are *regenerate* at the first, in our baptism. (Tit. iii. 5.) By Him, after *confirmed*, in the imposition of hands. (Heb. vi. 2.) By Him, after *renewed to repentance*, when we fall away, by a second imposition of hands. (1 Tim. v. 22.) By Him, *taught* all our life long, that we know not (John ii. 27), *put in mind* of what we forget (John xiv. 26); *stirred up* in what we are dull (2 Cor. iii. 6); *helped* in our *prayers* (Rom. viii. 26); *relieved* in our *infirmities* (John xiv. 16); *comforted* in our heaviness: in a word, *sealed to the day of our redemption* (Eph. iv. 30), and *raised up again in the last day* (Rom. viii. 11.) Go all along, even from our Baptism to our very resurrection, and we cannot miss him, but receive him we must."

* Ib. p. 632.

Here, clearly, regeneration at baptism is spoken of precisely in the same way as the other spiritual gifts and blessings here mentioned are spoken of, which confessedly are not given universally. The word "we" evidently refers, not to the whole professing Church, but to the true and faithful members of Christ's body, as it is frequently used by other authors, in passages which, from a misinterpretation of the word, as if it included the whole body of nominal Christians, are often quoted as proving the universal spiritual regeneration of all in baptism. And the very next words that follow in Bishop Andrews show that such is the case. For he proceeds,—

"And on the other side, 'Si non recepistis,' without him received, receive what we will, nothing will do us good: receive the word, it is but 'a killing letter;' (2 Cor. iii. 6.) *receive baptism, it is but John's baptism; but a barren element;* (Gal. iv. 9.) receive his flesh, it profiteth nothing; (John vi. 63.).... if we receive not Him, we be but 'animales, Spiritum non habentes,' only men of soul, having not the Spirit, (Jud. 1.) 'Et animalis homo,' the natural man that never received the Spirit, neither perceiveth nor receiveth the things of God, hath nothing to do with them.... The next point is, how to certify ourselves whether we have received this Spirit or no.... Of the Spirit, the signs are familiar. For if it be in us (as the natural spirit doth) at the heart it will beat, at the mouth it will breathe, at the pulse it will be felt. Some one of these may, but all these will not deceive us. At the heart we begin; for that is first, 'Dabo vobis cor novum et spiritum novum.' (Ezek. xxxvi. 26.) A new heart and a new spirit we shall find. We shall be 'renewed in the spirit of our mind.' (Ephes. iv. 23.).... That a new spirit is received, no better way to know, than by new thoughts and desires. That he that watches well the current of his desires and thoughts, may know, whether, and what spirit it is he is led by, old or new." (Serm. 5.)*

Here, evidently, it is taken for granted that baptism may have been received without its being accompanied by the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit, and the test of regeneration is placed in the state of the heart.

Again, in another Sermon on Luke iii. 21, 22, commenting on the voice from heaven at our Lord's baptism, "This is my

* Ib. p. 644. 645.

beloved Son, &c." he speaks, if possible, more plainly to the same effect. After having remarked,—

"Such are we, by baptism, made to God in Christ, through the renewing of the Holy Ghost—"

He adds soon after,—

"This voice, it came once more. Two several times it came. Once here at his baptism: and again, after, at his transfiguration in the mount, where he was not only said to be, but then and there showed to be, in glory, as the Son of God indeed; his face like the sun, his raiment like the lightning. And both of them pertain to us likewise: *the first is spoken of us, when by baptism we are received into Him*, FOR THE POSSIBILITY AND HOPE WE HAVE OF IT THEREBY. But time will come, when this second shall be spoken, and verified of us, likewise." (Serm. 8.)*

Words cannot be plainer than these.

And agreeably to this we find him elsewhere,—when commenting on the words "have all been made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 13), which refers, he tells us, to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,—making this remark:—

"That body which hath one beginning, and one nourishment, is one body; but all THE FAITHFUL have one beginning in the fountain of regeneration, that is, in baptism, and are all nourished with one nourishment; for they are all baptized into one body by one Spirit, and all made to drink of one Spirit: therefore they are all one body, and consequently should live in unity one with another."†

He clearly confines the blessing in both Sacraments to *the faithful*. As none but the faithful are spiritually nourished in the Lord's Supper, so none but the faithful are incorporated into Christ by baptism.

This principle is consistent with various shades of view as to the effects of baptism in infants. It may be supposed by some, that wherever there is an *immediate* effect from baptism, there must have been a prevenient act of grace; by others, that the baptismal blessing may be conferred in anticipation of future faith; by others, that the salutary effect of baptism is held in suspense until actual faith enables the party to realize it, and so forth. All these views are consistent with the adoption of this

* Ib. pp. 684, 685. † Posthumous Lectures, Lond. 1657. fol. p. 615.

principle. But if this cardinal truth is lost sight of, we sink at once into one of the worst errors of Popery. The question at issue is not one as to the efficacy of baptism, but as to the *necessary* bestowal by God of the full blessing connected with baptism whenever man chooses to administer the rite to an infant.

BISHOP HENRY PARRY;

Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth;—Dean of Chester from 1605 *to* 1616;—*Bishop of Rochester from* 1607 *to* 1610;—*and of Worcester from* 1610 *to* 1616.

"He was reputed by all of his time," says Anthony Wood,* "an able divine, well read in the Fathers," &c.

Now Bishop Parry translated and published, in 1591, the Catechism of Ursinus, which I have quoted in p. 149 above,† and which (as the reader has there seen) is written on the most strict Calvinistic views. And in his Preface to the Reader (to which his name is attached) he mentions that he had published this work especially for the instruction of the clergy, adding this remark:—‡

"And if it shall seem so good and expedient to their Honours [*i. e.* the Bishops], to adjoin these my labours unto the pains and travels of many the servants of God, who have with great praise endeavoured in the like matter, on the like respects heretofore; I make no doubt, but that out of this short yet full Summe of Christian Religion, God adding his blessing thereunto, they may in short time receive such furniture and instruction, as they shall save both themselves and others, who both else are in case to perish everlastingly."

BISHOP ARTHUR LAKE;

Dean of Worcester from 1608 *to* 1616;—*Bishop of Bath and Wells from* 1616 *to* 1626.

Of Bishop Lake Anthony Wood says,—

---

* Athen. Oxon. ii. 192. † See Wood, ib. 193.

‡ I quote from the reprint of 1645. The title of the work is, "The Summe of Christian Religion delivered by Zacharias Ursinus..... first Englished by D. Henry Parry, &c. &c." Lond. 1645, fol.

" In all these places of honour and employment, he carried himself the same in mind and person, showing by his constancy that his virtues were virtues indeed; in all kind of which, whether natural, moral, theological, personal, or pastoral, he was eminent, and indeed one of the examples of his time. . . . He was also well read in the Fathers and Schoolmen, and had such a command of the Scripture (which made him one of the best preachers) that few went beyond him in his time."*

The following Extracts are from a volume of his Sermons, published shortly after his death.†

" I must not omit to observe unto you, That if [of] God's election (I speak not of the eternal Decree, but the manifestation thereof in the church militant) there are two acts. The first is *the admission of persons into the outward congregation, and unto the sacramental obsignation; which is nothing else but the outward profession of man, that he is a party to the covenant of God;* and so Moses telleth the Israelites that God hath chosen them to be his peculiar people: which is no more than that God hath given them his Law, which he had not done to every nation. St. Paul addeth more particulars of this kind (Rom. ix.); and in this respect giveth the name of elect to whole churches of the Gentiles. But besides this outward, there is an inward act of election, and that is *the operation of the Holy Ghost giving unto us spiritual wisdom and holiness; making us God's children, and members of the mystical Body of Christ.* And *that Church which we believe in the Creed is partaker of both these acts of election, as well the inward as the outward;* and these latter are electi ex electis, whom Christ doth design when he saith in the Gospel, 'Many are called, but few are chosen.' Because there are none in this world actually of the Church invisible, but those that are in the visible; and *men cannot distinguish between the persons that partake either only one or both of the acts of election;* therefore in my text we will take the definition of a Church in the widest sense, according to the rule of charity which the Scripture observes, although the power of devotion doth properly concern the whole visible Body, *by reason of the better part thereof, those which are as well inwardly as outwardly of the Church.* The use that we must make of this definition of the Church is by the first word to be remembered of our Prerogative. If we do partake only the outward

---

* Athen. Oxon. ii. 399.

† Sermons, &c. by A. Lake, late Bishop of Bath and Wells. Lond. 1629. fol.

act of election, how much are we better than the heathen that know not the true God, nor the Saviour of the world Jesus Christ, and are destitute of all those means by which they may be saved? But if, looking into our heart, we find saving grace there (for God's Spirit doth witness unto our spirit that we are the children of God), when we contemplate in ourselves this second act of election, we have reason to think our prerogative much more improved, by how much an inward is better than an outward Jew; the circumcision of the spirit better than the circumcision of the flesh; *to be baptized with the Spirit better than to be baptized with water;* to eat panem, Dominum, eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, better than to eat only and drink only sacramental bread and wine."*

This, I suppose, is plain enough, and can hardly be misconstrued.

Again, he says,—

"The Sacraments are *sufficiently* sovereign for all; not so, *efficiently*, and yet *efficiently* for *many*. For although in comparison of unbelievers, believers are but few, yet considered in themselves, believers are many, both Jews and Gentiles." [Where he evidently limits the efficacy of Sacraments to believers.] "A Sacrament is an annex unto doctrine, even as a seal is set unto a pardon. The Sacraments of the Old Testament were so annexed unto the ceremonial law; so are the Sacraments of the New Testament unto the Gospel. As he that taketh the charter of pardon without the King's seal, when he may have it, loseth the benefit of his pardon; so he will have but little benefit of the Gospel, that is a contemner of the Sacraments: they must both go together until the world's end."†

Again;

"The Dove did signify that Christ would baptize with the Holy Ghost, and that he would communicate this power to none; he would transfer the ministry to men, but reserve the efficacy of baptism to himself, both while he was on earth, and as he now reigneth in heaven. For certainly the Sacring doth note this his possession and dispensation of the Holy Ghost; it is His Spirit, and he only giveth it; he sanctifieth the waters of baptism unto their sacred use,

---

* Sermon at Paul's Cross, among "Sermons, Lond. 1629." fol. pp. 533, 534.

† Serm. on Matt. xxvi. 26–28, among "Sundry Sermons, De Tempore," (in same vol.) p. 174.

and by his Spirit added unto them doth regenerate THOSE THAT ARE MEMBERS OF HIS CHURCH."*

Here we see who they are to whom alone, according to Bishop Lake, baptism is the "laver of regeneration."

And he thinks that regeneration, where given, is "*ordinarily*" given in baptism. For he says:—

"A prerogative the children of the faithful have, which St. Paul toucheth at, Rom. xi. 'If the root be holy, so are the branches.' But this holiness is in *possibility* rather than in *possession*, and there is a distance between natural generation and spiritual regeneration. Though by their natural birth-right, the children of the faithful have a right unto the blessings of God's Covenant, yet do they not partake them, but by their new birth, which ORDINARILY they receive in Baptism, which is therefore called the Bath of Regeneration."†

Again, he maintains that regeneration, when given, abides for ever. He says:—

"Mark, that the Israelites are bid to wash their garments, not to change them, though it appeareth, (Exod. xxxiii.) that they had change of raiment. There is a mystery in it; it signifieth that the children of God from the time they are incorporated into Christ, though they have often occasion to scour out the stains which their regeneration contracteth, yet they do not shift it; *it shall abide the same for ever, bettered in quality, but never altered in substance.*"‡

And his description of "regeneration," given in a comment on Psalm li. 10 ("Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me"), is this:—

"Our natural corruption is cured by grace, and grace doth cure it partly by forgiving, and partly by regenerating: of the forgiveness you have heard on the former verse, and on this verse you are to hear of the regeneration. And that which you shall hear is first, What, —then, Whence it is. In opening, What it is, the text will lead me to show you, first in what part we must have it, and secondly of what gifts it consists: the part is set down first in general, it is our inwards, we must have it within: but within we have many inwards, whereof here are two distinctly expressed, and they are two principal ones, the heart and the spirit, whereof the one noteth the sovereign, and the other the active power of our soul, these are the parts that are to be

* Sermons preached at Court (in same vol.) p. 167.
† Expos. of Ps. li. (in same vol.) p. 116.
‡ Expos. on Exod. xix. (in same vol.) p. 439.

regenerated. Now the gifts whereof this Regeneration consists, are Holiness and Stayedness; Holiness of the sovereign power, and of the active, Stayedness; the first we have if our heart be clean, and the other, if our spirit be right. This is Regeneration."*

Whether this agrees with the notion of all infants being spiritually regenerated in baptism, any one can judge.

He does not, however, (as we have seen) deny the efficacy of the Sacrament, but only its universal efficacy, its efficacy in the case of those of whom Christ will say hereafter, "I *never* knew you." Hence he says:—

"Though Sacraments be ceremonies, yet are they ceremonies of *efficacy*. Were they only of significancy, the Church might have some power to ordain them: but being of efficacy, their ordination belongeth only to God: because the efficacy floweth from his Spirit, and of his Spirit none can dispose but himself."†

And he ascribes (as in a passage already quoted) our incorporation into Christ to baptism:—

"As none might eat of the Paschal Lamb, but they that were circumcised, no more might any receive the Eucharist that was not baptized. The reason is plain: no man can be nourished except he live, and live to God no man can, but he that is incorporated into Christ, and incorporated he is by baptism."‡

He gives therefore to baptism the full force, value, and efficacy which can be ascribed to it; but only where it is an instrument in the hands of Him by whose power alone it can ever be efficacious.

BISHOP GEORGE CARLETON;

Bishop of Llandaff from 1617 *to* 1619; *and of Chichester from* 1619 *to* 1628.

This learned prelate was one of the four representatives of our Church at the Synod of Dort, and an able defender of the doctrine of our Reformers, against the innovations of the Laudian party.

* Serm. on Ps. li. (in same vol.) p. 149.
† Serm. on Matt. xxvi. 26—28 (in same vol.) p. 163. ‡ Ib. p. 172.

In his reply to Mountagu,* one of the earliest leaders of that party, he gives his judgment very clearly on the subject of our present inquiry.

Mountagu (who was afterwards promoted through the influence of Laud to a bishopric) had objected, "Let this be acknowledged the doctrine of our Church, that children duly baptized are put into the estate of grace and salvation: but many children so baptized, when they come to age, by a wicked life do fall away from God, and from that estate of grace and salvation wherein he had set them," from which he deduced the conclusion that either those that are once in a state of salvation may totally and finally fall away from it, or that it must be said that all that are baptized are saved.†

To this Bishop Carleton replies thus:—

"If our author had been pleased to have observed the judgment of the ancients, he would not be thus troubled with novelties. This one poor objection seemeth to trouble the man. Saint Augustine might easily have satisfied him. For he observeth a great difference between them that are regenerate and justified only *Sacramento tenus*, and those that are regenerate and justified according to *the purpose of God's election*. Abraham received the Sacrament of circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of faith. The Sacrament is good *to them to whom it is a seal of the righteousness of faith, but it is not a seal in all that receive the Sacrament; for* MANY RECEIVE THE SIGN, WHICH HAVE NOT THE THING. Then to proceed: Ismael was circumcised, and so was Isaac; but Ismael was born according to the flesh, and Isaac according to the Spirit. Now he was not justified, but only *Sacramento tenus*, that was born according to the flesh; but he that was born according to the Spirit, was justified truly. Saint Augustine saith, 'Cum essent omnibus communia Sacramenta, non communis erat omnibus gratia.' (August. in Ps. 77.) And again, 'Omnibus in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizatis commune est lavacrum regenerationis, sed ipsa gratia, cujus ipsa sunt Sacramenta, qua membra corporis Christi cum suo capite regenerata sunt, non communis est omnibus:' that is, 'When as the Sacraments are common to all, yet grace is not common to all.' And, 'The fountain of regeneration is common to all that are baptized in the name of the

* An Examination of those things, wherein the author of the late Appeal holdeth the doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the doctrines of the Church of England. 2nd Ed. revised. Lond. 1626. 4to.

† Appello Cæsarem, &c., by Richard Mountagu. Lond. 1625, 4to. pp. 35, 36.

Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; but that grace, whereof these are Sacraments, whereby the members of the body of Christ are regenerate with their head, is not common to all.' Israel was called to be a people of God, yet all that were so called, were not so in truth: so all that receive baptism are called the children of God, regenerate, justified: for to us they must *be taken for such in charity, until they show themselves other.* But the author affirmeth, that 'this is not left to men's charity, as you,' saith he, 'do inform the world, because we are taught in the Service Book of our Church earnestly to believe, 'that Christ hath favourably received these infants that are baptized, that he hath embraced them with the arms of his mercy, that he hath given unto them the blessing of everlasting life; and out of that belief and persuasion, we are to give thanks faithfully and devoutly for it.' All this we receive and make no doubt of it: but when we have said all, we must come to this, that *all this is nothing but the charity of the Church: and what more can you make of it?* For where he urgeth this, that children baptized are put in the state of salvation, and this must be believed, I make no doubt of it. . . . Concerning this judgment of charity, we do not inform the world any otherwise than St. Augustine informed the Church long since against the Pelagians. *The Pelagians urged these things as you do, that they that were baptized were regenerate and justified.* St. Augustine answereth they are so for ought that we know, and until they themselves shew themselves to the contrary. Then so long as we have no cause to the contrary, we judge them, *in charity,* to be such as we desire they should be: did we devise this? or did we first inform the world of this? it hath been of old received thus in the Church. *We* do but say that which the ancient *Fathers* have said before us: and *you* follow that which your Fathers the *Pelagians* have taught before you. But here is great difference; we following the ancient *Fathers,* follow the *Church;* and you following the *Pelagians,* follow the *enemies* of the *Church.* But here he citeth in the margent, page 36, '*that all antiquity taught thus.*' I pray you what did Antiquity teach? *That young children baptized are delivered from original sin.* We teach the same, and we doubt not, if they die before they come to the practice of actual sins, they shall be saved. But this is not so to be understood, that no children unbaptized can be saved. . . . Of these who have received the Sacrament of regeneration, and are judged by us to be regenerate and justified, many may proceed and make a great progress in the Church, to be 'enlightened, to taste of the heavenly gift, to be made partakers of the Holy Ghost,' (that is, of many graces of the Holy Ghost,) 'to taste of the good word of God, and of the powers of the world to come' (Heb. vi.), and yet they may fall away

totally and finally. But they that are regenerate, justified, and called according to God's purpose, (ask not me who these are, it is enough that they are known to God,) they may fall into divers temptations and sins, which bring men under God's wrath; but these never fall away either totally or finally. This was expressed by D. Overall, in the Conference at Hampton Court. By this distinction of men regenerate and justified *sacramento tenus* only, and such as are so *indeed according to God's purpose* and calling, he might easily and fairly have satisfied himself in all these objections, which he draweth out of the Book of Homilies and out of our Service Book. For first he hath not proved, that a justified man may fall away totally and finally; neither doth that follow from any words by him produced. And if it were proved in direct terms, how easy is the answer, that it is there meant of such as are regenerate and justified *sacramento tenus*, and no further: for, that such fall away, it was never doubted in the Church, as S. Austin showeth. And therefore, when he saith that children duly baptized are put into the estate of grace and salvation, I grant they are so to us: *we must esteem them so* JUDICIO CHARITATIS."*

While I am quoting from this work, it may be worth while to add an extract corroborative of a remark already made,† that those called Puritans were not originally considered by the authorities of our Church as differing from them in *doctrine*, but only in *discipline*. It was the Laudian party that first applied the term to matters of doctrine, and used it to stigmatize those who were attached to that true and genuine doctrine of the Church of England which they laboured to eradicate. Commenting on Mountagu's scoffing words when referring to a passage in Bellarmine,—"just your Puritan doctrine for final perseverance,"—Bishop Carleton remarks;—

"This is the first time that ever I heard of a *Puritan doctrine* in points *dogmatical*, and I have lived longer in the Church than he hath done. I thought that *Puritans* were only such as were factious against the Bishops in the point of pretended *Discipline*; and *so I am sure it hath been understood hitherto in our Church*. A Puritan *doctrine* is a strange thing, because it hath been confessed on both sides, that Protestants and Puritans have held the *same doctrines* without variance. The *Discipline* varied in England, Scotland, Geneva, and otherwere: yet the *Doctrine* hath been hitherto held the same,

* An Examination, &c., (as above,) pp. 193—208.

† See pp. 95, 96, above.

according to the *Harmony* of the several *Confessions* of these Churches. *Not one doctrine of the Church of England, another of the Church of Scotland, and so of others.* What is your end in this, but to make divisions where there were none? And that a rent may be made in the Church? Forsooth! that place may be given to the Pelagian and Arminian doctrines. And then all that are against these must be called *Puritan doctrines.*"*

And to the justness of these remarks we have certainly an impartial witness in our modern historian Hume, who says that "the doctrinal Puritans" "rigidly defended the speculative system of the first Reformers."†

And in another work,‡ Bishop Carleton expressly refutes the notion, "that Sacraments confer grace through the work wrought, even though there should be no good internal motion in him who receives them, supposing that no impediment is placed in the way;"§ which he speaks of as "an outlandish and unreasonable notion;"‖ and says that this doctrine seems to have sprung up about the age of John Scotus: adding (in a passage already quoted above¶),—

"Aquinas seems to have added some stones to this building when he taught, 'that the Sacraments of the New Law cause grace, after the manner of an instrument.' (3 par. q. 62. Art. 1.) These words gave occasion to the Sophists that followed to philosophize after their manner. But Aquinas has nothing about the work done, or about a bar. These things seem to have been added by those that came after. And thus the Tridentine Creed, like a patched coat made up of many and various rags, was at length put together and became one. Before these times this opinion was unheard of in the Church of Rome."

BISHOP GEORGE DOWNAME;

Bishop of Derry from 1616 *to* 1634.

Bishop Downame is called by Wood a "learned and painful writer."**

* Ib. pp. 121, 122.
† Hist. of Eng. ch. 51. a. 1629. (vi. 272. ed. 1778.)
‡ Consensus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ contra Tridentinos. Franc. 1613. 8vo.
§ Sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato, etiamsi in suscipiente non sit bonus interior motus, modo non ponatur obex. (p. 412).
‖ Peregrina et incondita sententia. (Ib.)
¶ See p. 219 above.
** Athen. Oxon. ii. 814.

The following extracts are taken from his "Treatise on the Certainty of Perseverance," published in 1631.

"All that are truly justified shall be glorified. Not all that are baptized shall be glorified. Therefore not all that are baptized are truly justified. For the better clearing of this point, we are to use divers distinctions; 1. In respect of Baptism. For there is an outward Baptism, which is the *washing of the flesh* (1 Pet. iii. 21) with water by the minister; and an inward Baptism, which is the washing of the soul with the blood of Christ by the Holy Ghost. The former is also the engrafting of the party baptized into the body of the visible Church, which is the society of those who profess the name of Christ: the other is the insition of him into the society of *the invisible Church*, which is *the mystical body of Christ* and *company of the Elect*: the former insition is wrought by the minister, the latter by the Holy Ghost, by whom (1 Cor. xii. 13.) we are baptized into one body. But *not every one that hath the outward baptism hath the inward*; no more than every one that had the external circumcision of the flesh, had the inward circumcision of the heart (Rom. ii. 28, 29.).... Neither is every one that is a member of the visible Church a true member of Christ, or of the Church invisible. Many being in the visible Church which are not of the Church invisible, who are among the faithful and elect as tares among the corn or chaff among the wheat. If it be said, that the visible Church is the body of Christ, I answer, that it hath the denomination from the better part, as a heap wherein is more chaff than wheat, is called a heap of wheat, and a field wherein are more tares and other weeds than corn, is also called a corn field. But if we will speak properly, that is not in deed the body of Christ which shall not be with him for ever, as Augustine saith. (De doctr. Christ. lib. 3. c. 33.)

"For if it were so, that every one that hath the outward baptism hath also the inward, and that every one that is made a member of the Church, is also made a true member of Christ, then it would also follow, that every one that is baptized should be saved. *For salvation is as well promised to the baptized as either regeneration or justification.* (Mar. xvi. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 21.) NEITHER ARE ANY REGENERATED, BUT SUCH AS ARE ELECTED: *nor any justified, but such as shall be saved.* If therefore it be true, that not all which have the outward baptism have the inward, then it is as certain, that not all that are baptized are justified, as, that not all that are baptized shall be saved.

"Yea, but they that are baptized have put on Christ.

"*Answ.* Those that have been baptized into Christ, as the apostle speaketh, (Gal. iii. 27,) that is, by baptism engrafted into him, have

put on Christ. But not all simply that have been baptized have put on Christ, unless you mean sacramentally.....

"Secondly, we are to distinguish the parties baptized, that they are either *adulti*, such as [are] come to years of discretion (of whom properly this controversy is understood), or infants wanting the use of reason. As for those that are baptized after they are come to years of discretion, it is certain, that no more are justified than do believe by a true justifying faith. For Sacraments are as seals annexed to the letters patents of God's evangelical promises, which assure or convey nothing but what is contained in the promise, and upon the same conditions. And it is absurd to extend the benefit of the Sacrament beyond the covenant..... Here therefore is confuted that most pernicious doctrine of the Papists, that the Sacraments of the Gospel which they call the New Law, do confer grace, and that *ex opere operato*, to them in whom not only there is no grace (for then it were *opus operantis)*, but not so much as any inward disposition or motion of grace beforehand. By which doctrine they have turned Christian religion to a mere outward formality, consisting in outward rites and observations, without any truth or power of religion in them, according to that prophecy of them. (2 Tim. iii. 5)..... As touching infants, I say in the first place, that this controversy is not understood of them, who neither are indued with habit of grace, neither are able to produce the acts thereof, as not having as yet the use of reason. And therefore being neither justified by faith, nor sanctified by the habits of grace, cannot be said to fall from them. Secondly, it is not necessary that every one that is baptized should presently be regenerated or justified. But the Sacrament of Baptism is a seal unto him of the righteousness of faith, which is the righteousness of Christ, either to be applied by the Holy Ghost *to the elect dying in their infancy*, or to be apprehended also by faith in them, who living to years of discretion *have grace to believe*.

"Thirdly, we are to distinguish of the effects of baptism, and of the time thereof. For it is not the effect of baptism to begin, or to work faith, which in those of years must go before baptism, neither can infants though baptized, whiles they want the use of reason, actually believe, but to seal to the baptized the righteousness of faith, and so to justify *sacramentally*, which effect is not to be restrained to the time when baptism is administered, but to be extended to the whole course of a man's life, whensoever he shall believe and repent. As for the elect which die before the use of reason, the sacrament of baptism is the seal and means of Christ's righteousness to be applied to them by the Holy Ghost. For as some have been sanctified from the womb, yea and some in the womb, so it is not to be doubted, but

that those infants whom God in their infancy intendeth to glorify, he doth bestow upon them his Spirit, which is the Spirit of faith, 2 Cor. iv. 13, and the Spirit of regeneration, whereby he doth illuminate their minds and sanctify their hearts, and every way prepare and fit them for his own kingdom.

"Fourthly, *we are to distinguish between* THE JUDGMENT OF CHARITY AND THE JUDGMENT OF CERTAINTY. For although in the general we know, that not every one that is baptized is justified or shall be saved, yet, when we come to speak of particulars, *we are to judge of them that are baptized that they are regenerated and justified, and that they shall be saved, until they shall discover themselves not to be such.* AND SO OUR BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER SPEAKETH OF THEM, AS THE SCRIPTURES ALSO TEACH US TO SPEAK OF THEM THAT ARE BAPTIZED, THAT THEY ARE REGENERATED AND ENGRAFTED INTO THE BODY OF CHRIST, THOUGH PERHAPS THEY BE REGENERATED SACRAMENTO TENUS, AND ENGRAFTED ONLY INTO THE BODY OF HIS VISIBLE CHURCH. *But this judgment of charity is no matter of certainty or of faith, but may be deceived.*

"The like judgment of charity our Church conceiveth concerning all those that die in the bosom of the Church, and depart this life in the profession of the faith; so that not all are justified before God, or sanctified by saving grace, who to us, *judging according to charity*, seem to be such.

"Lastly, the Papists themselves do teach, that the Sacraments do not confer grace to him that cometh to the Sacrament in the guilt of mortal sin, or, as they speak, *ponenti obicem mortalis peccati.* But all that come to be baptized are guilty (if not justified before) of mortal sin, not only *adulti*, who are of years, and have to their original sin added their own personal transgression; but INFANTS ALSO, who besides their original corruption, in respect whereof they are all naturally dead in sin, do also stand guilty of Adam's most heinous transgression, which without doubt was a mortal sin.

"You will say, then, to what use doth baptism serve? I answer, that the blood of Christ doth purge us from all our sins (1 John i. 7), ... well mortal, as those which the Papists call venial; that this washing of the soul by the blood of Christ is *res sacramenti*, the thing signified by baptism, whereof the outward baptism is a sacrament, that is, a sign to signify it, a seal to assure it to them that believe, an instrument of the Holy Ghost to apply it *to the elect and heirs of promise.* For there is no saving grace given, but according to God's purpose of grace given unto us in Christ before all times, and according to the covenant of grace made with the heirs of promise." ("A Treatise of the Certainty of Perseverance," annexed to

"The Covenant of Grace, or an Exposition upon Luke i. 73—75." Dublin, 1631. 4to. pp. 393—399.)

The following remarks are made by Archbishop Usher, and Dr. Samuel Ward, on the doctrine of Baptism, as here laid down by Bishop Downame.

Archbishop Usher, writing to Dr. Ward in 1630, says,—

"My Lord of Derry hath a book ready for the press, wherein he handleth at full the Controversy of Perseverance and the Certainty of Salvation. He there determineth that point of the efficacy of baptism far otherwise than you do, *accommodating himself to* THE OPINION MORE VULGARLY RECEIVED AMONG US."*

To which Dr. Ward replies,—

"My Lord of Derry is a worthy man, and whom I do much reverence; yet I would wish his Lordship to be well advised. I doubt not but the doctrine of perseverance may sufficiently be cleared, though we grant that all infants baptized be free from original guilt. .... I KNOW, MOST OF OUR DIVINES *do make the principal end and effect of all sacraments to be obsignation, and all sacraments to be merely obsignatory signs; and consequently that ablution of infants from original sin is only conditional and expectative, of which they have no benefit till they believe and repent;* I cannot easily assent hereunto."†

ARCHBISHOP USHER;

Bishop of Meath from 1620 *to* 1624;—*Archbishop of Armagh from* 1624 *to* 1655.

It would of course be superfluous to add a word here to the name of Archbishop Usher, to shew the claim which his testimony has upon us as a witness to the doctrine of our Church.

The first extract I shall give is from one of his letters, to which there is no date, but which could not have been written before 1618.

"Election being nothing else but the purpose of God, resting in his own mind, makes no kind of alteration in the party elected, but only the execution of that Decree and purpose, which in such as

* Usher's Life and Letters, by Parr. Lond. 1686, fol. Lett. 159, p. 434.
† Ib. Letter 160, p. 438.

have the use of reason is done by an effectual calling, in all by *spiritual regeneration, which is the new birth, without which no man can see the kingdom of God.* . . . . . I wrote but even now, that God did execute his Decree of election in all by *spiritual regeneration:* but if any shall say, that by all, thereby I should understand the universality of all and every one in the world, and not THE UNIVERSALITY OF ALL THE ELECT ALONE, he should greatly wrong my meaning."*

This is decisive of the question, to whom Archbishop Usher considered spiritual regeneration to be given.

The same doctrine is also taught in a Brief Catechism, which, though it was first published without his consent, was afterwards reviewed and published by the Archbishop himself, under the title, "A brief method of the doctrine of Christian Religion," with a preface acknowledging himself to be the author, in 1653,† and since frequently reprinted. From a reprint of this edition of 1653‡ I give the following extracts.

"Q. How doth he rule his subjects?

"A. By making the Redemption which he hath wrought effectual *in the Elect:* calling those, whom by his prophetical office he hath taught, to embrace the benefits offered unto them; and governing them being called: both by these outward ordinances which he hath instituted in his Church, and by the inward operation of his blessed Spirit.

"Q. Having thus declared the Natures and Offices of Christ, the Mediatour of the new covenant: What are you to consider in the condition of mankind which hold by him?

"A. Two things: the participation of the grace of Christ effectually communicated by the operation of God's Spirit unto the Catholick Church, which is the Body and Spouse of Christ, out of which there is no salvation: and the outward means ordained for the offering and effecting of the same vouchsafed unto the visible Churches.

"Q. How is the grace of Christ effectually communicated to the Elect, of whom the Catholick Church doth consist?

"A. By that wonderful union, whereby Christ and his Church are made one: so that all *the Elect*, being ingrafted into him, grow up together into one mystical body, whereof he is the head.

"Q. What is the bond of this union?

"A. The communion of God's Spirit: which being derived from

* Ib. Letter 23, pp. 50, 51.

† See Parr's Life of Usher; Lond. 1686, fol. p. 62.

‡ Attached to his "Body of Divinity," 8th ed. Lond. 1702. 4to.

the Man Christ Jesus unto all the Elect, as from the Head unto the Members, giveth unto them spiritual life, and maketh them partakers of Christ with all his benefits.

"Q. What are the benefits which arise to God's children from hence?

"A. Reconciliation and Sanctification.

"Q. What is Reconciliation?

"A. That grace, whereby we are freed from God's curse, and restored unto his favour.

"Q. What are the branches of this Reconciliation?

"A. Justification and Adoption."

* * * * * * *

"Q. Is there no distinction to be made among them that thus receive Christ?

"A. Yes: for some are not capable of knowledge; as infants, and such as we term naturals: other some are of discretion. In the former sort, we are not to proceed further than God's election, and the secret operation of the Holy Ghost. In the other there is required a lively faith, bringing forth fruit of true holiness."

* * * * * * *

"Q. What is a Sacrament?

"A. A visible sign ordained by God to be a seal for confirmation of the promises of the Gospel unto those who perform the conditions required in the same.

"Q. How is this done by a Sacrament?

"A. By a fit similitude between the sign and the thing signified, the benefit of the Gospel is represented unto the eye, and the assurance of enjoying the same confirmed to such as are within the Covenant. Wherefore as the preaching of the Word is the ordinary means of begetting faith; so both it, and the holy use of the Sacraments, be the instruments of the Holy Ghost to increase and confirm the same."

* * * * * * *

"Q. What are the *Sacraments* of this Ministry?

"A. The Sacrament of Admission into the Church is Baptism; which sealeth unto us our spiritual Birth: the other Sacrament of our continual Preservation is the Lord's Supper; which sealeth unto us our continual nourishment." (pp. 421—425.)

There is also another work, which, though not to be strictly considered as one which is in the state in which he himself would have published it, must still be held as, in all important points, expressing his views: namely, that entitled, "A Body of Divinity, or, the Sum and Substance of Christian Religion, catechis-

tically propounded and explained." This work was first published in 1645 by John Downame, (son of George Downame Bishop of Chester, and brother of George Downame Bishop of Derry, and himself the author of several excellent works,) as a work of Archbishop Usher's. The book was published without the Archbishop's consent from a transcript of a MS. lent by the Archbishop to some friends.* We are told, however, by his chaplain Dr. Nicholas Bernard, that "indeed, he was displeased at the publishing of it, without his knowledge, but hearing of some good fruit which hath been reaped by it, he hath *permitted it.*"† Several other editions therefore were published in his lifetime, and being thus published with his *permission*, must of course be considered as, in all important points of doctrine, representing his views. The following extracts are taken from this work.‡

"But is Christ and the cleansing power of his blood only barely signified in the Sacrament of Baptism?

"Nay more: the inward things are really exhibited to the believer as well as the outward; there is that Sacramental union between them, that the one is conveyed and sealed up by the other. Hence are those phrases of '*Being born again of water and of the Holy Ghost,*' John iii. 5: of '*Cleansing by the washing of water,*' Ephes. v. 26, &c.: so, '*Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,*' Acts xxii. 16: so, Rom. vi. 3, '*We are buried with Christ by baptism, &c.*' The Sacraments being rightly received, do effect that which they do represent.

"Are all they then that are partakers of the outward washing of Baptism, partakers also of the inward washing of the Spirit? Doth this Sacrament seal up their spiritual ingrafting into Christ to all who externally receive it?

"Surely no. Though God hath ordained these outward means for the conveyance of the inward grace to our souls; yet there is no necessity that we should tie the working of God's Spirit to the Sacraments more than to the Word. The promises of salvation, Christ, and all his benefits, are preached and offered to all in the Ministry of the Word: yet all hearers have not them conveyed to

* See Parr's Life of Usher; Lond. 1686, fol. p. 62.

† The Life and Death of Archbishop Usher. By Dr. N. Bernard. Lond. 1656. 8vo. pp. 41, 42.

‡ The copy used is the 8th edition, Lond. 1702, 4to.

their souls by the Spirit; but those whom God hath ordained to life. So in the Sacraments, the outward elements are dispensed to all, who make an outward profession of the Gospel, (for in infants their being born in the bosom of the Church is instead of an outward profession,) because man is not able to distinguish corn from chaff; but the inward grace of the Sacrament is not communicated to all, but to those only who are heirs of those promises whereof the Sacraments are seals. For without a man have his name in the Covenant, the Seal set to it confirms nothing to him.

"What is the advantage, then, or benefit of Baptism to a common Christian?

"The same as was the benefit of Circumcision to the *Jew* outward, Rom. ii. 28; Rom. iii. 1, 2: there is a general grace of Baptism which all the baptized partake as of a common favour; and that is their admission into the visible body of the Church, their matriculation and outward incorporating into the number of the worshippers of God by external communion. And so as Circumcision was not only a seal of the righteousness which is by faith, but as an overplus God appointed it to be like a wall of separation between *Jew* and *Gentile:* so is Baptism a badge of an outward member of the Church, a distinction from the common rout of Heathen; and God thereby seals a right upon the party baptized to his ordinances, that he may use them as his privileges, and wait for an inward blessing by them. Yet this is but the porch, the shell, and outside: all that are outwardly received into the visible Church, are not spiritually ingrafted into the mystical body of Christ. Baptism always is attended upon by the general grace, but not always with this special.

"To whom then is Baptism effectual to the sealing up this inward and special grace?

"We must here distinguish of persons baptized. The Church doth not only baptize those that are grown and of years; if any such being bred Pagans be brought within the place of the Church, and testify their competent understanding of Christianity, and profess their faith in the Lord Jesus and in God's precious promises of remission of sins by his blood; and their earnest desire to be sealed with Baptism for the strengthening of their souls in this faith: but the Church also baptized her infants, such as being born within her bosom of believing parents are within the Covenant, and so have right unto the seal thereof.

"Doth the inward grace always accompany the outward sign in those of years baptized?

"No; but only then when the profession of their faith is not outward only and counterfeit, but sincere and hearty; they laying hold

on Christ offered in the Sacrament by a lively faith, which is the hand to receive the mercies offered. Acts viii. 37, '*If thou believest with all thy heart,* thou mayest be baptized;' saith *Philip* to the Eunuch. For it were absurd to extend the benefit of the seal beyond the Covenant. Now the Covenant is made only in the faithful, John i. 12; Mark xvi. 16. '*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not,* whether he be baptized or no, shall be condemned.' *Simon Magus* (Acts viii. 13) and *Julian,* and thousands of Hypocrites and Formalists, shall find no help in the day of the Lord by the holy water of their baptism, without it be to increase their judgment.

"But what say you of infants baptized that are born in the Church; doth the inward grace in their baptism always attend upon the outward sign?

"Surely no: the Sacrament of Baptism is effectual in infants, only to those and to all those who belong unto the election of grace. *Which thing though we (in the judgment of charity) do judge of every particular infant, yet we have no ground to judge so of all in general:* or if we should judge so, yet it is not any judgment of certainty; we may be mistaken.

"Is every elect Infant then actually sanctified and united unto Christ in and by Baptism?

"We must here also distinguish of elect Infants baptized, whereof some die in their infancy, and never come to the use of reason; others God hath appointed to live and enjoy the ordinary means of faith and salvation.

"What is to be thought of elect Infants that die in their infancy, and have no other outward means of salvation but their baptism?

"Doubtless in all those the inward grace is united to the outward signs; and the Holy Ghost doth as truly, and really, and actually apply the merits and blood of Christ in the justifying and sanctifying virtue unto the soul of the elect Infant, as the Minister doth the water to its body, and the invisible grace of the Sacrament is conveyed by the outward means.

"But how can an Infant be capable of the grace of the Sacrament?

"Very well. Though Infants be not capable of the grace of the Sacrament by that way whereby the grown are, by hearing, conceiving, believing, yet it followeth not that Infants are not capable in and by another way. It is easy to distinguish between the gift conveyed, and the manner of conveying it. Faith is not of absolute necessity to all God's elect, but only to those to whom God affords means of believing. It is the application of Christ's righteousness that justifieth us, not our apprehending it: God can supply the

defect of faith by his sanctifying Spirit, which can do all things on our part which faith should do. Do we not know that the sin of *Adam* is imputed to children, and they defiled by it, though they be not capable to understand it; even so the righteousness of Christ may be, and is, by God's secret and unknown way, to elect Infants: and so to those that are born deaf, and fools, not capable of understanding. For though God tieth us to means, yet not himself: he that hath said of Infants, *To them belongs the kingdom of God*, knows how to settle upon them the title of the kingdom. And we have no reason to think, but that even before, or in, at or by, the act of Baptism, the Spirit of Christ doth unite the soul of the elect Infant to Christ, and clothe it with his righteousness, and impute unto it the title of a son or daughter by Adoption, and the image of God by sanctification; and so fit it for the state of glory.

"But what is to be thought of the effect of Baptism in those elect Infants whom God hath appointed to live to years of discretion?

"In them we have no warrant to promise constantly and extraordinary work to whom God intends to afford ordinary means. For though God do sometimes sanctify from the womb, as in *Jeremy* and *John Baptist*, sometimes in Baptism as he pleaseth; yet it is hard to affirm (as some do) that every elect Infant doth ordinarily, before or in Baptism, receive initial regeneration, and the seed of faith and grace. For if there were such a habit of grace then infused, it could not be so utterly lost or secreted as never to shew itself but by being attained by new instruction. But we may rather deem and judge that Baptism is not actually effectual to justify and sanctify, until the party do believe and embrace the promises.

"Is not Baptism then for the most part a vain empty shew, consisting of shadows without the substance, and a sign without the thing signified?

"No: it is always an effectual seal to all those that are heirs of he Covenant of grace: the promises of God touching Justification, Remission, Adoption, are made and sealed in Baptism to every elect child of God; then to be actually enjoyed, when the party baptized shall actually lay hold upon them by faith. Thus Baptism to every elect Infant is a seal of the righteousness of Christ, to be extraordinarily applied by the Holy Ghost, if it die in its infancy: to be apprehended by faith, if it live to years of discretion. So that as baptism administered to those of years is not effectual unless they believe; so we can make no comfortable use of our Baptism administered in our infancy until we believe. The righteousness of Christ and all the promises of grace were in my Baptism estated upon me and sealed up unto me on God's part: but then I come to have the

profit and benefit of them, when I come to understand what grant God in Baptism hath sealed unto me, and actually to lay hold upon it by faith.

"Explain this more clearly.

"We know that an estate may be made unto an Infant, and in his infancy he hath right unto it, though not actual possession of it until such years. Now the time of the child's incapability, the use and comfort of this estate is lost indeed; but the right and title is not vain and empty, but true and real, and stands firmly secured unto the child to be claimed what time soever he is capable of it. Even so Infants elect have Christ and all his benefits sealed up unto them in the Sacrament of Baptism; yet through their uncapableness they have not actual fruition of them, until God give them actual faith to apprehend them. Is Baptism lost then which is administered in our infancy? Was it a vain and an empty ceremony? No, it was a complete and effectual Sacrament; and God's invisible graces were truly sealed up under visible signs. And though the use and the comfort of Baptism be not for the present enjoyed by the Infant; yet by the parent it is, who believes God's promises for himself and for his seed, and so by the whole Congregation; and the things then done shall be actually effectual to the Infant, whenever it shall be capable to make use of them." (pp. 366—369.)

BISHOP WILLIAM BEDELL;

Bishop of Kilmore from 1629 *to his death in* 1642. *Previously Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.*

The name of Bishop Bedell is too well known to need any introduction. But it may be remarked, that he was promoted to the bishopric of Kilmore, "on the recommendation of Laud, at that time Bishop of London."*

The following passages are from two of his letters to Dr. Ward, written expressly on the subject of Baptism, and preserved among the letters of Archbishop Usher in Parr's Collection.† The second extract is a long one, but it appears to me too valuable to be curtailed.

* Bishop Mant's History of the Church of Ireland. 2d. ed. Lond. 1841. Vol. 1. p. 434.

† See letters CLXI. and CLXIII. in Parr's Life and Letters of Usher. Lond. 1686. fol.

LETTER CLXI.

"*Part of a Letter of the Right Reverend William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, to Dr. Ward, Master of Sidney College, Cambridge, Anno* 1630, *out of Bishop Bedell's Papers.*

"*A passage in my former Letters to Mr. Doctor Ward.*

"I thank you for the two Treatises, that of my Lord of Salisbury, and your own, which you were pleased to communicate to me. Concerning which, to give you mine opinion shortly, for the present. This I do yield to my Lord of Sarum most willingly, that the *justification, sanctification,* and *adoption which children have in Baptism,* is not, *univocè,* the same with that which *adulti* have. And this I likewise do yield to you, that it is *vera solutio reatus, et veracitèr, et in rei veritate* performed, and all the like emphatical forms, &c. But all these *sacramentalitèr,* and that is *obsignativè ex formula et conditione fœderis.* Where you make Circumcision and Baptism to be *the remedy of Original Sin,* I think it be too specially said, which is true of all sin. And so much the text Acts ii. 38. with the rest do shew. I do think also that *Reprobates coming to years of discretion, after baptism, shall be condemned for Original Sin.* For their absolution and washing in Baptism was but conditional and expectative, which doth truly interest them in all the promises of God, but under the condition of repenting, believing, and obeying, which they never perform, and therefore never attain the promise. Consider well what you will say of women before Christ, which had no circumcision, and of all mankind before circumcision was instituted; and you will perceive, I think, the nature of sacraments to be not as medicines, but as seals, to confirm the covenant, not to confer the promise immediately. These things I write now in exceeding post-haste, in respect that this bearer goes away so presently. I only give *sapienti occasionem.* I think the emphatical speeches of Augustin against the Pelagians, and of Prosper, are not so much to be regarded, (who say the like of the Eucharist also) touching the necessity and efficacy in the case of infants, and they are very like the speeches of Lanfranck and Guitmund of Christ's presence in the Sacrament, opposing *veracitèr et verè* to *sacramentalitèr;* which is a false and absurd contraposition. *Sed manum de Tabulâ.*

"The right definition of a Sacrament in general will decide this question." (p. 440.)

LETTER CLXIII.

"Part of a Letter from the Right Reverend William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, to Dr. Samuel Ward.

"First, you say, If Sacraments be merely obsignatory, and the ablution of sins in baptism only conditional and expectative, of which the baptized have no benefit till they believe and repent, then infants baptized, dying in infancy, have no benefit by baptism. This consequence methinks is not good: for they are by baptism received into the visible Church, which is a noble privilege of comfort to parents, and honour and profit to themselves. Again, there is presently granted them an entrance into covenant with God, as was anciently by circumcision with the God of Abraham, wherein God promises pardon of sin and life eternal upon their faith and repentance: and in this they have a present right, tho' the accomplishment be deferred. Yet if God take them out of this world while the condition is in expectation, most pious it is to believe that he takes the condition for performed: Like to him that solemnizeth a marriage with her to whom he was betrothed *sub conditione.* And here, if the souls of Christians be indued with any actual knowledge at all, so soon as they leave the body; it seems the mystery of redemption by Christ is revealed unto them, and faith is given them, whereby they cleave to God by him, the author of their blessedness, although they have no need now of the obsignation of the promise whereof they are in present possession.

"The second reason. Non-elect infants living, shall thus have no benefit at all by baptism. I answer. Where there be divers ends of one and the same thing, the denial of one is not the denial of the rest. These non-elect infants have offered by God the same with the other, viz., the obsignation of the covenant, and aggregation to the Church. The same that he hath also, *qui fictus accedit ut ponit obicem gratiæ,* as to the present possession of it. All that come to the Sacrament, elect or non-elect, receive the pardon of sin original and actual sacramentally: and whosoever performs the condition of the covenant, hath the fruition of that, whereof before he had the grant under seal. So as the sacraments are not *nuda et inefficacia signa* on God's part, to the one or other.

"Thirdly, (you say) What necessity of baptizing infants, if their baptism produce no effect till they come to years of discretion? Though the most principal effect be not attained presently, the less principal are not to be refused. So children were circumcised, which could not understand the reason of it; and the same also did eat the

Passover. And so did also children baptized in the primitive Church communicate in the Lord's Supper. Which I know not why it should not be so still, *de quo alias.*

"Fourthly, Our divines, you say, generally hold that the sacraments do offer and exhibit the grace which they signify, and in order of nature, do first offer and exhibit before they assure and confirm. For God doth,

"1. Offer and exhibit grace promised in the sacraments.

"2. We exercise our faith, resting upon God promising and exhibiting.

"3. So we receive the grace promised.

"4. Then the Sacraments assure us of the grace received.

"And this order you endeavour to confirm out of the definition of a Sacrament in our Catechism: you declare it in the Eucharist, and bring divers testimonies of our writers to prove it.

"I answer. The grace which the Sacraments confer, is of three sorts. The first is, The spiritual things which are proportionable to the outward. The second, The effects of these. The third, The certification of the party in the lawful use of the outward, of the enjoying the two former. As in Baptism, 1. The blood and Spirit of Christ. 2. The washing of sin, and new birth. 3. The obsignation to the party baptized, that by Christ's blood his sins are cleansed.

"The first of these is signified in that common sentence, That sacraments consist of two parts, an outward visible sign, and an inward invisible grace.

"The second is the most usual and common notion of the word Grace; meaning some spiritual favour, in order to salvation promised in the New Covenant. The last is most properly the grace of the Sacrament itself. For the two former (which our Catechism seems to reduce to one) are properly the grace of the Covenant, which God doth confirm and seal by the Sacraments.

"As when the King's Majesty grants lands and tenements with certain immunities and privileges thereunto appertaining, as in his Letters Patents at large appeareth, and sets to the Great Seal: all the grants and articles in the Patent are confirmed thereby *materialiter et subjective*, but the ratification of the Patent is properly and formally that which the seal works: which also, according to the form of the Patent, may be simple or conditional, present, or *ad diem*, according as his Majesty is pleased.

"As touching the terms also of offering and exhibiting, they may be taken two ways: either of the offering and propounding: so doth Calvin take the word [exhibet] in the Covenant, and institution of

the Sacraments; (Inst. iv. 17. 10.) or, 2, confirming in the use of them. These things thus premised, it seems to me that the order is this: God doth,

"1. Offer his Covenant (under the condition of faith and repentance) and therein Christ and his benefits.

"2. We accept of the Covenant according to the tenor of it.

"3. God offers to confirm it with Sacraments proportional.

"4. We receive them, and so are certified of the performance of the Covenant, and have the promises thereof conveyed by Covenant, and by seal also unto us.

"Where you say, 'In the Eucharist God doth first offer and exhibit growth, and increase of grace, and a nearer and faster communion of Christ's body and blood, and all the benefits flowing from thence; and then it is a pledge to assure us thereof'—It seems to me that God having in the New Testament (confirmed with Christ's blood) offered unto us life under the condition of our receiving him; would confirm to as many as receive him that they have life. Therefore he hath instituted bread and wine, the means of natural life, in a certain use, to be seals of spiritual life. We now receiving them, they are pledges unto us, and do certifie us of that spiritual life which we have by receiving Christ.

"Where then you say, 'That the instrumental conveyance of the grace signified, is as true an effect of a Sacrament as obsignation, and is præ-existent in order of nature unto it'—I do conceive that the setting of Christ and his benefits before us in the Gospel, (as the Bread that came down from heaven) and in the institution of the holy Supper, in the proportional creatures of bread and wine, with condition that these, worthily received, shall confer those, must needs go before any obsignation. But then our partaking of these creatures duly, giveth unto us the possession of the former by way of obsignation; which in our purpose is the sole and only instrumental conveyance which the Sacraments have.

"You will ask, What is the due participation? That which God requires. There can be required no more of infants but the receiving of the outward washing in baptism: they cannot prove themselves, nor repent and believe. Very true. Have they then that obsignation? Yes, doubtless, according to the form of the Covenant. How is that? That *repenting and believing, their sins are washed away.* Then, because they do not yet repent and believe, nothing passes: Yes, this passes, *The confirmation that this Sacrament gives upon repentance and belief of all God's promises of the New Testament.* The same thing which passes to him *qui fictus accedit:* who when afterward he doth indeed repent of his fiction, and receives Christ by faith, hath also the actual enjoying of the thing so confirmed to him.

"The opinion of the Franciscans out of Scotus and Bernard, mentioned in the Council of Trent, seems to be the true opinion; for they make the Sacraments to be effectual, because God gives them, *effectus regulariter concomitantes;* and to contain grace no otherwise than as an effectual sign; and that grace is received by them as an investiture by a ring or staff, which is *obsignando.* Which agrees also with Catharine's opinion, *de intentione ministri:* and Eisingrens saith, that God only can give to sensible signs virtue to confer grace. (Confess. c. 1.) Yet I believe they understand the matter otherwise than I have before expressed. Their authority is of little moment either way. *Beza, Ursine, and Calvin have no other meaning than I have expressed.* Mr. Hooker I have not.

"'Since infants (say you) are capable of baptism, why not of spiritual ablution of original guilt? which is the thing signified, though not of actual obsignation of this, since they cannot interpose any impediment to hinder the operation of the Sacraments.'

"Questionless they are partakers of the actual obsignation of ablution from original and actual guilt (say I.) Suppose they understand not this obsignation, nor receive this ablution otherwise than sacramentally? As I said before, the counterfeit convert also doth: though he put a bar to his present ablution of his sins, and consequently his own certification thereof.

"Where I said, 'The true definition of a Sacrament in general will decide this question,' which you grant, and commend that of our Catechism—I do not disallow it, being well interpreted; but do think incomparably better that of the Apostle; *That they be seals of the righteousness of faith.* Or if we will include the Sacraments of the state of grace before the fall: They be seals of God's Covenant concerning everlasting happiness. If yet more generally we will include the rain-bow, Gen. ix.: They be seals of God's Covenants.

"The definition of Scotus, (In 4 dist. 1. 9. 2.) 'Signum sensibile gratiam Dei ejus effectum gratuitum ex institutione divinâ efficaciter signans, ordinatum ad salutem hominis viatoris,' methinks is a good definition, especially declaring *efficaciter* as he doth, 'et in hoc efficaciter' (saith he) 'includitur tam certitudinaliter, quam prognosticè.' I know that he acknowledges no Sacrament *pro statu innocentiæ,* but without all reason, and the definition will serve well enough for both states; where he and the other Schoolmen require since the Fall some remedy for original sin; and I perceived the same form in your determination, 'Certum esse Christum Sacramentum Baptismi instituisse in remedium originalis peccati et ad reatus ejusdem veram solutionem'—I conceived you meant to make that the proper effect of baptism: which seemed also to be implied in the explication of

the question in the first sentence, and after, 'Cumq; Baptismus potissimum institutus sit ad solutionem originalis peccati,' &c. You know what it is to demonstrate specially of one sort of triangles that which is true in all; which made me a little touch upon that point. But verily, I think this conceit of Sacraments to make them medicines, is the root of all error in this matter; and that it is good to take light from the Tree of Life, and that of the knowledge of good and evil, that they are *seals only to God's promises*. In my last to you, as I remember, I gave you occasion a little to consider the case of women under the law, and of all mankind before circumcision. Methinks it is very inconvenient to say, that the males should have a remedy against sin, and the females none. And the Schoolmen when they will first lay down their own conceit, that such a remedy there must be, and then divine what it must be: they make Bellarmine ridiculous, who from the silence of Holy Scripture herein, labours to shew the Scriptures are insufficient, (De verb. non scr. c. 4.) and yet he cannot help us here by any traditions. This inconvenience is well avoided by making the Sacraments *to confer grace only by obsignation of God's promises, and the end of them to be certioration*. For so long as God would have men rest upon his mere word and promise without a seal, his word alone was to suffice: when he gave a seal, that was to have validity as far as he extended it. Now he extended circumcision to all Abraham's seed, males and females, yea to the males and females of all that were adjoyned to Abraham, though but bought with his money: And the circumcision of the males was an obsignation of God's Covenant to the females also. Lastly: in the New Testament, willing to make more ample demonstration of his love, and more abundantly to confirm the truth of his promises, he hath appointed the obsignation of them even to both sexes, and to every several person: Whereby he hath not made their condition worse, who without contempt do want it, but theirs better which are partakers of it. Which I speak in regard of the imagined necessity of baptism to infants to salvation, as if it were indeed a medicine to *save life*, whereas it is only an assuring that Christ *gives life*.

"Consider how Baptism was given to them who had remission of sins and the gifts of the Holy Ghost also before, who therefore could have no other intention therein but certification only, and adjoyning to the Church. Acts x. 44.

"Consider how it hath force about sin, not only going before it, but following also; yea even to them that at the time of the outward receiving it do *ponere obicem*, else such ought to be re-baptized.

"Consider that if the faith of the parents, or the Church, were effectual before circumcision was instituted for the taking away of

original sin from infants, or under the law from female children; it is no less effectual at the present under the Gospel. And this presupposing that some mean must come between to make them partakers of Christ. Wherefore the same mean yet standing, the effect of Baptism needs not to be assigned justification, or ablution from sin, but testification to the receiver, when he repents and believes, that he is washed from sin.

"Consider that if you will aver that Baptism washes away otherwise than sacramentally, that is, obsignatorily, original sin; yet you must allow that manner of washing for future actual sins. And you must make two sorts of justification, one for children, another for *adulti*: and (which passes all the rest) *you must find some promise in God's covenant, wherein he binds himself to wash away sin without faith or repentance (for that children have these I think you will not say)*. You seem also to break the chain of the Apostle, Rom. viii. 30, Whom he hath justified, he hath glorified.

"Lastly; by this doctrine, you must also maintain that children do spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, if they receive the Eucharist (as for divers ages they did, and by the analogy of the Passover they may, perhaps ought); since they do not *ponere obicem contrariæ cogitationis aut pravæ operationis*. And sith the use of this Sacrament *toties quoties* must needs confer grace; it seems it were necessary to let them communicate, and the oftener the better, to the intent they might be stronger in grace. Which opinion, though St. Austine and many more of the ancients do maintain, I believe you will not easily condescend unto, or that children dying without baptism are damned: which if baptism be the remedy that takes away original sin, I see not how you can avoid." (pp. 440—445.)

These remarks of Bishop Bedell are well worth the attention of the reader, both from the character of the author, and their intrinsic value.

I now add, lastly, a series of testimonies from the works of a few eminent theological writers of the same period.

DR. WALTER HADDON, 1577.

Dr. Haddon, though a civilian, may yet, from the way in which he was employed, well claim to be heard as a witness of

the doctrine of our Church at the period at which he wrote. As I have already observed,* he was employed by Archbishop Cranmer, in conjunction with Peter Martyr and others, to draw up the "Reformatio Legum;"† and subsequently, when filling the post of "Master of Requests" to Queen Elizabeth, he defended the Reformation of the Church of England from the attacks of Osorius, a Portuguese bishop. His first work in this controversy was a letter in reply to one of Osorius, addressed to Queen Elizabeth;‡ which having been answered by Osorius, he commenced a rejoinder, part of which only he had finished at the time of his death in 1571. John Fox, the Martyrologist, however, having completed it, it was published in 1577 (4to), under the title "Contra Hieron. Osorium, ejusque odiosas insectationes pro Evangelicæ veritatis necessaria Defensione, Responsio Apologetica." Strype, when speaking of these works, calls Dr. Haddon "a man of great abilities in learning, and experience of the state and affairs of this nation," and considers that he was employed by Secretary Cecil to draw them up.§ Now in this work, and in the portion of it written by Dr. Haddon, we have the following remarks on the doctrine of our Church as to the Sacraments.

"But you persist, and desire to know, what the Sacraments are. If you know, and feign that you do not, why will you trifle in a grave matter; if you are ignorant, what sort of a theologian must I account you, who understandest not the elements of religion? 'Nay,' say you, 'I have no difficulty as to the scholastic Sacraments, but I know nothing of your bare images by which ye deny that the grace of God is obtained.' O Osorius, in these few words how many faults are there! For first, who besides yourself ever called the Sacraments images? Some have called them signs of sacred things; others, marks; some, pledges of our salvation; some, symbols; and others otherwise. But you first devised images in the Sacraments. But as far as words are concerned, let us be lenient, although you are often most difficult to please with respect to them; let us attend to things. You say that 'bare images are brought forward by us as Sacraments.' How bare, O Jerome? We agree with Augustine, that the Sacraments are signs of sacred things: or, in other words, are visible signs of an invisible grace.* For you will grant me the same liberty of words which you

* See p. 57 above. † Strype's Cranmer, i. 192. Oxf. ed.
‡ See his "Lucubrationes," 1567, 4to. § Annals, ch. 37, I. ii. 69 et s.

take yourself. We admit, that in baptism we are regenerated to eternal life. We grant, that in the Eucharist the Lord Jesus is truly exhibited to those that believe by the spirit and faith. By all which it is proved, that those on our side do not take the Sacraments for bare signs, but for things most efficacious, for things most divine, for things altogether necessary to our salvation. They are most holy mysteries of our religion, they are most certain instruments of heavenly grace: yet nevertheless God our Father, who formed us of clay, is not tied to his own instruments, nor in bondage to creatures; but *has compassion on whom he will have compassion, and pardons our sins, not for the sake of the Sacraments, but for his own sake.* Finally, life eternal is not from the Sacraments, but is the gift of God through Jesus Christ. Therefore we reject and repudiate your spurious and bare images, as idle dreams of your own brain, and we use the true Sacraments as things most sacred, as assurances to faith and pledges of our salvation: *yet nevertheless we do not attribute so much to them, as that through them, as through channels, from the mere work wrought, the grace of God should be necessarily imparted to us. We remit this impiety to your schoolmen, from whom this poison first flowed. For the inheritance is given* OF FAITH *according to grace.* The Sacraments are signs to be reverenced of the Divine favor, they are noble memorials of our religion, they are most perfect testimonies of our salvation. But if you cannot be contented with these praises of the Sacraments, heap up more, to your liking; we will willingly admit of them; *if only you do not affix the grace of God of necessity to these signs. For we are not saved by the reception of the Sacraments.* But if we shall confess with our mouth the Lord Jesus, and shall believe in our hearts that God hath raised him from the dead, by that of itself we shall be saved. The Emperor Julian was baptized into the name of Christ, and yet he died in open blasphemy. Judas Iscariot fed upon the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and yet he passed from the table directly to the enemies of the Lord Jesus, and betrayed the innocent blood. What need is there of many words? The Sacraments are most precious signs of the Divine favor, but *they do not obtain the Divine favor.* The Sacraments are *excellent memorials of piety*, but *they do not produce piety.* He who boasts, must not boast in the Sacraments, but in the Lord. Since we are of God in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."*

* Sed instas, et scire vis, quid sint Sacramenta. Si scis, et dissimulas, cur in re seria jocari libet; si ignoras, cujusmodi te Theologum statuam, qui religionis elementa non tenes? 'Imo,' inquis, 'in sacramentis scholasticis non hæreo, vestras non novi nudas imagines, quibus negatis Dei gratiam conciliari.' Paucissimis verbis, Osori, quot peccata! Nam primum,

No one can doubt what is the doctrine of the words I have here given in Italics.

DR. ROBERT SOME, 1582;

Master of Peter House College, Cambridge, (on the nomination of the College, confirmed by the Archbishop of Canterbury) from 1589 *to* 1608.*

The following extracts are taken from Dr. Some's Treatise on the Sacraments, published in 1582.

---

sacramenta præter te quis unquam imagines appellavit? Signa quidam rerum sacrarum, alii notas, nonnulli arrabones nostræ salutis, nonnulli tesseras, et alii aliter. Sed imagines in sacramentis tu primus es architectatus. Verum in verbis faciles simus, licet tu sis in illis sæpe morosissimus, res persequamur. 'Nudas dicis imagines a nostris pro sacramentis afferri.' Quomodo nudas, O Hieronyme? Cum Augustino consentimus, sacramenta rerum sacrarum esse signa: vel aliter: esse signa visibilia gratiæ non visibilis. Dabis enim mihi eam veniam verborum, quam tu ipse tibi sumis. Concedimus, in baptismo nos ad æternam vitam regenerari. Largimur in Eucharistia dominum Jesum spiritu et fide credentibus vere exhiberi. Quibus omnibus efficitur, nostros sacramenta pro nudis signis non accipere, sed pro rebus efficacissimis, pro rebus divinissimis, pro rebus ad salutem nostram prorsus necessariis. Mysteria sacrosancta sunt nostræ religionis, instrumenta cœlestis gratiæ sunt certissima: nec tamen Deus Pater, qui nos ex luto finxit, instrumentis suis est alligatus, nec creaturis mancipatus: sed *miseretur quorum misereri vult, et peccata nostra condonat, non propter sacramenta, sed propter se.* Postremo, non ex sacramentis, sed donum Dei est vita æterna per Jesum Christum. Nos igitur commentitias et nudas imagines, tanquam otiosa cerebri tui somnia respuimus et repudiamus, et veris sacramentis utimur, ut rebus sacratissimis, ut fidei pignoribus et obsidibus nostræ salutis: *nec tamen illis tantum tribuimus, ut per illa, tanquam per canales, ex opere operato, gratia Dei necessario infundatur. Hanc impietatem ad scholasticos tuos relegamus, unde virus hoc primum dimanavit. Nam* EX FIDE *datur hæreditas secundum gratiam.* Sacramenta divini favoris signa sunt veneranda, religionis nostræ monumenta sunt magnifica, testimonia sunt nostræ salutis perfectissima. Quod si non potes his sacramentorum laudibus esse contentus, plures accumula, tuo arbitratu; libenter admittemus: *modò Dei gratiam his signis necessariò non affigas. Non enim perceptione Sacramentorum servamur.* Sed si confessi fuerimus ore nostro dominum Jesum, et crediderimus in cordibus nostris, quod Deus illum excitavit e mortuis, eo uno salvi erimus. Julianus Imperator in Christi nomen baptizatus fuit, et tamen in aperta blasphemia mortuus est. Judas Iscariotes Eucharistiæ sacramento vescebatur, et tamen a mensa statim ad inimicos Domini Jesu transiluit, et sanguinem innocentem prodidit. Quid multis opus est? Sacramenta signa sunt pretiosissima divini favoris, *sed divinum favorem non conciliant.* Sacramenta sunt *egregia pietatis monumenta, sed pietatem non efficiunt.* Qui gloriatur, non in sacramentis glorietur, sed in Domino. Quoniam ex Deo nos sumus in Christo Jesu, qui factus fuit nobis sapientia a Deo, justitiaque, et sanctificatio, et redemptio. (Lib. 2, fol. 38, 39.)

* See Le Neve's Fasti, p. 421.

"Circumcision was to the Israelites a sacrament of regeneration: Baptism is so to us. By circumcision, the Israelites were incorporated into God's visible Church: so are we by baptism. Circumcision was to them a sign of God's covenant: so is baptism to us." (R. Some's Godly and Short Treatise of the Sacraments. Lond. 1582. 16mo. B 7. *The book is not paged.* Trin. Coll. Cam. Libr. G. 13, 38.)

"The sign must not be confounded with the thing signified in the sacrifice [sacrament].*

"For not every one that receiveth the sign is partaker of the thing signified. This is clear in Simon Magus for baptism, and in the traitor Judas for the Lord's Supper.

"The water of baptism is one thing, the blood of Christ signified by the water is another thing: the water purgeth our bodies, Christ's blood purgeth our souls: without partaking of baptism (so that contempt be absent) we may be saved, without Christ's blood we can never be saved.

"The bread of the Sacrament is one thing, the body of Christ is another; the bread entereth only into the bodily mouth, Christ's flesh entereth only into the soul: without eating the bread of the sacrament (so that contempt be absent) we may be saved, without eating of Christ's flesh we can never be saved.

"It is a miserable bondage of the soul, to take the signs (in the sacraments) for the things signified by them. (Aug. de doct. Christ. lib. 5, cap. 5.)

"I confess that the name of the thing signified is given sometime to the sign. Circumcision is said to be the covenant between God and Abraham (Gen. ch. 17, ver. 10), when notwithstanding it was not the covenant but the sign of God's covenant. The Lamb is called the Lord's Passover (Exod. ch. 12, ver. 11.), but the Lamb was not the passage itself (of the Israelites out of Egypt), but remembered unto them the benefit of that great deliverance of theirs out of Egypt. The bread in the Lord's Supper is called the body of Christ, but it was only a figure and sign of Christ's body: (Aug. contra Adimant. cap. 12.) and yet the worthy receiver which brings faith and repentance with him to the Lord's Supper, is partaker as of the bread and the wine, so of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus." (Ib. B 8, C 1.)

"The sacramental signs offer grace unto all, but do not of their own nature confer grace unto all that do receive them.

"Many have been partakers of the sacraments, which notwithstanding were very ungracious. Many of the Jews received circum-

* The "Table" at the beginning "shows that sacrifice" is a typographical erratum for "sacrament."

cision of the flesh without circumcision of the heart. Simon Magus received baptism but not regeneration: Judas received the bread of the supper, but not the body of Christ.

"*The Sacraments do bring to pass that which they do figure, only in the elect.* (Aug. de bapt. parvul.)*

"We neither do nor may attribute forgiveness of sins to the external element otherwise than instrumentally. We must by no means say that grace is contained essentially in the Sacraments, as water in a vessel, or as medicine in a box, but the Sacraments are said to contain grace, *because they be signs of grace.*

"It is a certain truth that the Sacraments do always retain their nature. Baptism is a laver of regeneration. (Tit. ch. 3, ver. 5.) The Lord's Supper is the communion of Christ's body and blood, (1 Cor. ch. 10, ver. 16.) though no spark of faith remained in the world: but *we receive not the grace which is offered by the Sacraments, unless we bring faith to the partaking of the Sacraments.*

"If any ask me, why the infants of the faithful, which have not faith, are presented to baptism, I answer, that though they have not faith, yet they are under God's covenant, whereof baptism is to us a sure warrant and confirmation.

"Objection. The Church is cleansed by the washing of water through the word, (Eph. ch. 5, ver. 26.) therefore baptism doth confer salvation.

"Answer. The apostle joins together the word of life and the washing of water; as if he should say, by the Gospel the message of our washing and sanctification is delivered unto us, and by baptism the same message is sealed up unto us." (Ib. C 2, C 3.)

"The Sacraments are not naked and bare signs.

"*In baptism, the efficacy of God's Spirit is present to wash and regenerate* THOSE WHICH APPERTAIN UNTO GOD.

* * * * * * *

"The Sacraments are not bare signs, because we have the Lord's institution: they are seals of righteousness and tokens of grace, they are sure warrants of God's promises, whereby God bindeth himself unto us and we likewise stand bound to his Majesty, so that God is our God and we are his people." (Ib. C 3, C 4.)

"*God's children* receive great benefit by baptism, for all that are baptized into Christ have put on Christ. (Gal. c. iii. v. xxvii.)" (Ib. C 5.)

---

* The *reference* here is to the passage quoted by Peter Lombard as from Augustine, but which is not now to be found in any printed edition of his works. The quotation, however, equally illustrates Dr. Some's view.

"It is a common and a very sound speech, that not the want, but the contempt of baptism bringeth condemnation." (Ib.)

"What good we receive by the Sacraments.

"We are put in mind by the Sacraments of Christ's inestimable benefits, which by the laver of water purgeth us in baptism, and by his flesh feedeth, and by his blood refresheth our souls in the Lord's Supper: our faith is confirmed and increased by the Sacraments: we are by them stirred up, to perform great duty and thankfulness to Almighty God; we are severed by the Sacraments (as by a partition wall) from all such, as are not entered into the profession of Christianity, and we are by the Sacraments more surely linked together amongst ourselves." (Ib. C 7.)

"Baptism is a Sacrament of regeneration consisting of water and the Spirit by the word of God, whereby we have forgiveness of sins and everlasting life according to Christ's promise.

"The infants of the Israelites were circumcised when they were eight days old: our baptism is come into the place of their circumcision. . . .

"The children of the faithful are holy, (1 Cor. c. vii. v. 14,) they are under God's covenant (which covenant is contained in these words, I will be thy God and the God of thy seed, Acts, ch. ii. ver. 39,) therefore they may not be barred from baptism, which is a seal of God's covenant." (Ib. C 8.)

"All that die before baptism are not damned, because *we are Christians before we are baptized.*

"Abraham was justified before he was circumcised; otherwise circumcision could not have been called by Saint Paul a seal of the righteousness of faith. (Rom. ch. iv. ver. 11.; Acts, ch. 2, ver. 38, 39.)

"God's promise belongs to Christian infants before their baptism (otherwise baptism, which is a seal of this promise, should be denied them): therefore they are children of the promise, and consequently Christians before they are baptized.

"If infants dying before baptism are damned, two gross absurdities would follow: first the salvation of our infants should rest not upon God's covenant, which is the groundwork of our salvation, but upon *the seal which is put to the covenant:* secondly, the salvation and damnation of infants should consist in the diligence and negligence of their parents, &c.

"Baptism was ministered in Thessalia only on Easter day, and in Carthage, in Tertullian's time, only at Easter and Whitsuntide. (Socrat. lib. 5, cap. 22. Tertull. de Baptis.) If the infants of the faithful be not Christians before their baptism, what shall we say of the infants of Thessalia and Carthage, which died before Easter?

"The Papists themselves, when they baptize one of years, ask these questions of him before his baptism: Dost thou believe, dost thou renounce the devil? The party answers, I believe, I renounce the devil. Whereby it is clear, that he either is indeed, or at the least is esteemed of them to be a Christian before he is baptized, and so consequently admitted by them to the partaking of that Sacrament.

"Plain men of the country do mark only those sheep for their own, which they either know or at the least do take to be their own. Baptism is one of God's seals. The Church doth only mark those with this seal, whom they either know or at the least do take before the administration of baptism to be God's lambs and sheep. If they which are offered to baptism, are God's sheep and lambs before their baptism, it is a clear case that they are Christians before they are baptized, and consequently that baptism is *not the cause but a seal of our conjunction with Almighty God.*

* * * * * * *

"Objection. Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. (John ch. 3, ver. 5.)

"Answer. If we understand this of baptism, what shall we say of the Emperor Valentinian which went to Ambrose the Bishop of Mediolanum to be baptized, and was slain in his journey before he came to Ambrose: shall we condemn him for want of baptism, because Christ said to Nicodemus, Except a man be born, &c.? This dealing were very peremptory. If answer be made, that Valentinian's desire of baptism is a sufficient defence, I grant it was so: and, if the Emperor's desire keep him out of the compass of condemnation, why may not God's promise be sufficient to deliver the infants of the faithful from condemnation if they die unbaptized: for not the want but contempt of baptism doth condemn us. Besides our Saviour Christ's speech was with Nicodemus, which was of good years, and might have at his pleasure the use both of water and a minister for this godly purpose.

"Question. If the infants of Christians be under God's covenant before they be baptized, their baptism seems to be superfluous: why are they baptized?

"Answer. God's commandment must be fulfilled. He commanded both circumcision and baptism, and punished the contempt of circumcision sharply in the Israelites, and will punish the contempt of baptism grievously in us. Besides God's promise which pertaineth to our infants (Acts, ch. 2, ver. 38, 39.) must be confirmed with the outward seal of baptism, that we may be always mindful of God's promise. Lastly, the godly prayers of the minister and of them which offer the child to baptism, do greatly profit the infant, and the congregation which is then present at the administration of baptism receives some instruction touching their salvation." (Ib. D 2—D 5.)

Maintaining that "baptism must not be iterated," he observes,—

"To be once regenerate, and to have once entered into Christ's Church, is sufficient, *neither is any of God's elect cast out at any time: for he that is once endued with the spirit of sanctification is always endued with the same spirit of sanctification.* My reasons are these.

"The gifts and calling of God are without repentance. (Rom. ch. 11, ver. 29.)

"The word of God whereby we are regenerate, is immortal seed, (1 Pet. ch. 1, ver. 23.) that is to say, *never dieth in his children.* The shield of faith may be wounded, but it cannot be stricken through.

"Whosoever is born of God sinneth not, for his seed remaineth in him, neither can he sin, because he is born of God. (1 John, ch. 3, ver. 9, and ch. 5, ver 18.) The Apostle John meaneth, not that sin dwelleth not in God's children, but that it hath not dominion over them: and therefore Paul saith not, Let not sin dwell, but, Let not sin reign in your mortal bodies. (Rom. ch. 6, ver. 12.)

"David dealt very strangely with Urias and with the Lord's army: (2 Sam. ch. 11, ver. 4, 15, 24.) his faith seemed to be quenched, but he was not clean spoiled of all sparks of grace: there remained as it were a quick coal in the ashes: otherwise the prophet Nathan had not so easily and speedily awaked him. (2 Sam. ch. 12, ver. 13)

"Christ's resurrection is a notable pillar of our faith, and the very lock and key of all religion. The Apostle Thomas doubted so much of it, that he uttered these words: Except I see in his hands the print of the nails, &c.... (John ch. 20, ver. 25.) This sin of Thomas was so gross, that it might be felt with the fingers; and yet faith was not clean extinguished in him, as appeareth by his answer to Christ, My Lord and my God. (John ch. 20, ver. 28.)

"They which think, that they are utterly void of God's Spirit in whom the fruits of the Spirit do not always appear, are like unto them which think there is no fire where there is no flame, and that trees are dead in winter, because they bring forth neither fruit nor leaves in winter." (Ib. D7, D8.)

DR. JOHN PRIME, 1582;

Fellow of New College, Oxford: and Vicar of Adderbury.

The following extracts are from Dr. Prime's Treatise on the Sacraments, published in 1582.

"A Sacrament is a sensible sign to the eye, instituted of God to be continued in his Church, for the further assurance and increase of spiritual graces *in the faithful*. Of which sort is Baptism and the Supper, and only these two, even as they are jointly specified by the Apostle to the Corinthians. (1 Cor. x.)

"In the general may be observed these four notes chiefly. 1. The institution to be of God. 2. The sign visible in sense and resemblance convenient. 3. The graces secret and mystical, but singular benefits *to the faithful man*. 4. The continuance is the Church's duty, rightly to use and to enjoy his ordinances as beseemeth the Church of God.

* * * * * * *

"Every Sacrament hath ever these two members, the outward sign and the inward grace, and without the sign is no grace sacramentally signified at any time, neither is the show of a sign sufficient, it must be material and able in a convenient proportion, to demonstrate and declare to man's frail capacity, the grace implied and signified, as shall better appear in the specials afterward.

"The signs barely looked upon in themselves, they are base matters, earthly elements, common and ordinary: but put once the prince's stamp to the metal, the seal to the wax, the wax and seal to the Lord's promise, the case is altered. For earthly, common, and usual elements, that a little before were, do put now upon them, and are endued with divine considerations: yet still in substance remaining the same, but in efficacy, virtue, service, ends, signification and representation of graces, base things become beautiful and marvellous, being thus sequestered by God himself to so high and holy purposes, and therefore are usually termed by the very names that the graces themselves are called by. And this is also a common rule amongst the Fathers. See it so in examples out of the Scriptures. Circumcision is the covenant, the Lamb the Passover, the ark the Lord, Baptism our burial, Christ the rock, the Bread his body, the Cup his blood, because the analogy of these things is lively, the proportion plain, the signs significantly ordained of God: and being thus uttered, they more affect our faith, and touch our affections.

"Thirdly, the graces (that is, the inward part of the Sacraments) are, though singular in consolation, yet secret in the mystery of their operation. GOD WORKETH HOW HE LISTETH, AND ON WHOM HE PLEASETH.... The graces we reap and receive by Christ in the Sacraments (so great and gracious are they) they may be termed graces of graces: as namely, remission of sins, imputation of righteousness sanctification of life, and a special application of our Saviour Jesus. *Neither yet for all this (which is diligently to be noted) do we tie or bind his goodness so hereby, that he must needs work with*, or cannot work without, these means, by his Spirit, the salvation of them whom

he had *chosen and destinated to eternal life before all worlds*. . . . Salvation is neither kneaded into the dough, nor mingled with water, no more than with the word, which is as Hierom (in Psal. 147. iii. cap. eccle.) saith more truly Christ, but proceedeth from God, and is conveyed by ordinary means of either word or outward signs, where they are not contemned, but may conveniently be had, and are reverently used as they ought." (J. Prime's Treatise on the Sacraments. Lond. 1582. 16mo. fol. A4, A7, A8, B1. The pages are not numbered. Cambr. Univ. Libr. G. 15. 80.)

But when proceeding to speak of Baptism generally, he has no hesitation in describing it as,—

"The Sacrament of regeneration in water, whereby our sins are cleansed, we clad with Christ, endued with his Spirit, our names entered among the number of Christian professors, in the name of the blessed Trinity." (Ib. fol. B3.)

DR. WILLIAM FULKE. 1583—1589.

Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, from 1578 *till his death in* 1589.

Dr. Fulke's general view of the character of the Sacraments may be seen from the following passage,—

"That the Sacraments help nothing toward our salvation, is another of Martin's slanders, no assertion of ours. For seeing *we hold that the Sacraments are seals of God's promises, to confirm our faith by which we are justified before him*, how can we affirm that they help nothing to salvation."*

But he has spoken elsewhere more expressly on the particular point which is the subject of our present inquiry.

In his Confutation of the Annotations on the New Testament by "the Papists of the traiterous Seminarie at Rhemes," first published in 1589, he thus speaks on the subject of Baptism.

On the words, "We are buried together with him by baptism into death," in Rom. vi. 4, the Rhemists had given this com-

* Defence of the Sincere and True Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English tongue against G. Martin. [First published in 1583.] P.S. ed. p. 450.

ment :—" Remission of sin, new life, sanctification and justification are given by baptism, because it resembleth in us and applieth to us Christ's death and resurrection, and engraffeth us into him." Upon which Dr. Fulke remarks,—

"Baptism is a seal of the justification by faith, and therefore assureth us of remission of sin, renovation and sanctification, that God giveth unto us being justified. The application of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, is the proper work of the Holy Spirit, by whom we are regenerate, which is resembled and ratified by the external seal of baptism, which testifieth that we are ingraffed into the similitude of his death and resurrection."*

Again, on the words, "We that are baptized &c." in verse 3, the Rhemists gave the following annotation: "That which before he challenged from the law of Moses to faith, is now attributed to baptism, which is the first Sacrament of our faith and the entrance to Christian Religion, whereby it is plain that he meaneth not only faith to justify, but the Sacraments also, and all Christian Religion, which he calleth the Law of spirit, grace, and faith." On which Dr. Fulke remarks,—

"St. Paul ascribeth our justification before to faith without works, therefore he doth not now make baptism a cause thereof: but of the ends and effects of baptism, he proveth that sanctification and renovation is necessary, for all that are justified freely by the grace of God, through faith in Christ. The same argument may be drawn from circumcision, to prove, that the Jews before Christ ought to bring forth the fruits of sanctification and renovation. Yet the Apostle by express words excludeth circumcision from being a cause of justification, because Abraham was justified before he was circumcised, 'Who is the form of justification of all men,' as S. Ambrose saith. (Com. in ep. ad Gal. cap. 3.) And baptism succeeding in the place of circumcision, is a seal of justification by faith, in all Christians, as circumcision was in Abraham, not a cause thereof. Neither can justification before God by baptism, or any works of Christian Religion, be concluded out of this text."†

Again, on the following Chapter, he speaks still more plainly as to who those are in whom alone baptism is effectual. The note of the Rhemists on the words, "You also are made dead,"

---

* Fulke's Confutation of Rhemish Annotations on the New Testament. Lond. 1617, fol. p. 453.

† Ib. p. 454.

in verse 4, is this:—"Being now baptized and dead to sin, and engraffed in Christ's mystical body, you are discharged of the Law of Moses, and are free in Christ." On which Dr. Fulke says,—

"Baptism *in the elect* is a seal of their incorporation and conformity unto the death and resurrection of Christ, but not a cause thereof. For all are not incorporate to Christ's mystical body, but only the true members thereof."*

And the note of the Rhemists on the words, "Newness of spirit, &c." in verse 6, being,—"By Baptism we have not Christ's justice imputed unto us, but an inward newness of spirit given us and resident in us;" Dr. Fulke observes,—

"By faith we have Christ's justice imputed unto us, whereof baptism is a seal: and the newness of spirit which is resident in us, is the work of the Holy Ghost, not of the external act of baptism: for then it should be in all that are baptized, but IT IS ONLY IN THE ELECT OF GOD. *For the reprobate, though they have the external seal of baptism, yet they have not renovation of the Spirit, neither are they regenerate to be God's children*, for if they were his children, they should be his heirs, Rom. viii. 17."†

It would be easy to add other passages to the same effect from Dr. Fulke's writings.‡ But the above are too clear to make this at all necessary, and are extracted from his latest writings.

RICHARD HOOKER, 1597.

The name of Hooker is a sufficient introduction to anything that comes from his pen.

In a preceding page we have seen what his views were on the points called Calvinistic, and these are decisive (unless we suppose great inconsistency) as to his opposition to the notion, that spiritual regeneration is always conferred upon infants in baptism.

* Ib. p. 456. † Ib. p. 457.

‡ See for instance his "Answer to a Popish Apology," p. 84; and his "Confutation of the doctrine of purgatory, &c." p. 35, in "Two Treatises against the Papists," 1577. 8vo.

The following passage however goes directly to the point, and while it shows that he held that original sin was always pardoned in infants at baptism, clearly maintains that the language of our Church respecting the spiritual regeneration of infants at baptism is founded on the *supposition* that they are "elect."

"Were St. Augustine," he says, "now living, there are which would tell him for his better instruction, that to say of a child, 'it is elect,' and to say it doth believe, are all one, for which cause, sith no man is able precisely to affirm the one of any infant in particular, it followeth that 'precisely' and 'absolutely' we ought not to say the other. Which 'precise' and 'absolute terms' are needless in this case. *We speak of infants as the rule of piety alloweth* both to speak and think. They that can take to themselves in ordinary talk a charitable kind of liberty to name men of their own sort God's dear children (notwithstanding the large reign of hypocrisy) should not methinks be so strict and rigorous against the Church for PRESUMING *as it doth* of a Christian innocent. For when we know how Christ in general hath said that of such is the kingdom of heaven, which kingdom is *the inheritance of God's elect*, and do withal behold how his providence hath called them unto the first beginnings of eternal life, and presented them at the well-spring of new birth *wherein original sin is purged*, besides which sin there is no hindrance of their salvation known to us, as themselves will grant; hard it were that having so many fair inducements whereupon to ground, we should not be thought to utter at the least a truth as *probable and allowable* in terming any such particular infant an elect babe, as in presuming the like of others, whose safety nevertheless we are not *absolutely* able to warrant."*

Here, no doubt, as elsewhere,† he seems to maintain that the infant is purged from the guilt of original sin; but the terms applying to it as an "elect" child are used only in the spirit of *charity*. And true spiritual regeneration Hooker believed to be given only to the elect.‡

Again; he says that,—

"Sacraments . . . . contain in themselves no vital force or efficacy,

---

* Eccl. Pol. V. lxiv. ed. Keble. Oxf. 1836. ii. 398, 399.
† Ib. lxii., and Answer to Christian Letter in Keble's ed. Vol. 2, p. 701.
‡ See passages given above, pp. 111, 112.

they are not physical but moral instruments of salvation, *duties of service and worship, which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable.* FOR ALL RECEIVE NOT THE GRACE OF GOD WHICH RECEIVE THE SACRAMENTS OF HIS GRACE: neither is it ordinarily his will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, but by the Sacraments; *which grace also they that receive by sacraments or with sacraments, receive it from him and not from them.*"*

And while he speaks of baptism as "the door of our actual entrance into God's house," and "to our sanctification here a step that hath not any before it," he in the same sentence takes care not to represent it as the first act of grace towards the child, by speaking of it as "the first APPARENT beginning of life," and as "*a seal perhaps to* THE GRACE OF ELECTION BEFORE RECEIVED."†

We may thus at once clear up Mr. Keble's difficulty as to Hooker's views, expressed in his Preface to his Works, p. 102. After supposing that Hooker had a scruple about receiving the fifth Lambeth Article (for which supposition there is no valid ground), he adds,—

"It may be, that when he came to weigh more exactly his own doctrine of the Sacraments, he felt that it could not well stand with the supposed indefectibility of grace. For how could or can any person, beholding what numbers fall away after baptism, hold consistently, on the one hand, that real sanctifying grace can never be finally forfeited; on the other, that it is given at baptism? which latter Hooker unquestionably holds: for these are his words (E. P. V. lx. 2.) 'Baptism is a sacrament which God hath instituted in his Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through his most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused Divine virtue of the Holy Ghost which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life.' This is one passage among many attributing to baptism when not unworthily received, and THEREFORE *in all cases to infant baptism,* no less than justifying or pardoning grace, together with the first infusion of that which sanctifies. It is for those who suppose the writer an uncompromising Calvinist, to explain how these representations can be reconciled with Calvin's doctrine of the absolute perpetuity of justifying and of the first sanctifying grace. *It is not here meant to deny that such reconciliation*

* B. ch. lvii. § 1. ii. 329. † B. ch. lx. § 3. ii. 341.

may be possible, but the Editor has never yet met with it. And until some way be discovered of clearing up this difficulty, it will be at least as fair in the advocates, as they are called, of free-will, to quote Hooker's doctrine of the Sacraments, as in predestinarians to insist on his doctrine of final perseverance."

Now it appears to me, that Mr. Keble's difficulty is easily removed. For it arises from this, that he has *assumed* a principle as to the universal worthiness of infants to receive in baptism the full baptismal grace, which is entirely opposed to Hooker's system of theology, and then interpreting Hooker's statements by this principle, he knows not how to reconcile them. His conclusion, that because Hooker's words attribute certain effects to baptism, "when not unworthily received," "*therefore*" they attribute them "*in all cases to infant baptism*," even "no less than justifying or pardoning grace, &c.," is thoroughly unfounded, nothing less in fact than a *petitio principii*. It is clear from various passages in Hooker's works, that he held that "the elect" only experienced *such* benefit from baptism, for he expressly maintains that *such a blessing* is never lost. Mr. Keble has himself quoted the first three passages of those given above to this effect from his works; and then somewhat naïvely adds, "It is not quite clear why a person holding such an opinion as this should scruple to receive the fifth Lambeth Article: yet Hooker it seems had such a scruple." It is indeed very far from clear; and the fact is, that the only ground which Mr. Keble has for telling us that "it seems" he had a scruple, is, that in a paper of Hooker's, drawn up in reply to the "Christian Letter," and published from the MS. in Trin. Coll. Dublin by Mr. Keble, in his edition of Hooker, there is a statement of his views on the subject, drawn up in eight brief articles, *which do not adopt the precise words of the Lambeth Articles*. But if Mr. Keble will look again, he will find in the immediate context of these articles the passage which I have quoted above from that paper, as edited by himself, and which I need hardly say is quite as strong as the 5th Lambeth Article itself.

We may observe, however, that Mr. Keble himself interprets his *general* statements as to the benefits conferred by baptism, as meaning that such benefits are conferred by it only "when not unworthily received."

DR. ANDREW WILLET. 1600.

Prebendary of Ely, and afterwards Chaplain to Prince Henry, eldest son of James I.

"Dr. Willet," Chalmers tells us,—

"Was usually called a living library, from the great extent of his reading and of his memory. He was also not less admired as a preacher, not only in his parish, but at Court. He also obtained a great degree of celebrity by his numerous publications, particularly his 'Synopsis Papismi, or a General View of Papistry,' a work dedicated to the Queen, which, although a folio of 1300 pages, passed through five editions, and was much admired in both Universities, and by the clergy and laity at large, as the best refutation of Popery which had then appeared."*

The third edition of this work was published in 1600, the fourth in 1613, and the fifth in 1634. That of 1634 was a reprint of the edition of 1613, and was published after his death, (which took place in 1621), "by the authority of his Majesty's Royal Letters Patent," as the title states. In this Patent it is declared, that Dr. Willet was "very painful on the behalf of the Church," and that his Synopsis had been "seen and allowed by the Bishops, in great esteem in both of the Universities, and much desired by all the learned both of the Clergy and Laity throughout the King's dominions."†

---

* Chalmers's Biograph. Dict.

† The Patent is given at length in Rymer's Fœdera; from which I give the following extract, where the reader will observe the language in which the work is spoken of.

"De licentia speciali Paulo Willett Clerico pro impressione libri intitulati *Synopsis Papismi*." (Pat. 6 Car. I. [1630] p. 11, n. 28.)

"Charles, &c. . . . Whereas our well beloved subject Paule Willet, Clerk, Master of Arts, hath by his humble petition shewed unto us, that his late Father Doctor Willet deceased, was known to be very painful on the behalf of our Church, and amongst the rest of his labours left behind him a Book intituled *Synopsis Papismi*, four several times dedicated to our late Royal Father King James (of ever blessed memory), whose princely and discerning wisdom approved and constantly patronaged the same; and that it hath been *seen and allowed by the Lords, the Reverend Bishops, and hath also ever since been in great esteem in both of our Universities, and also much desired by all the learned both of our clergy and laity throughout our Dominions;* and that the Stationer who heretofore had the copy thereof, being not able, or at least not willing, to disburse or expend so much monies as the charge of reprinting the same will require,

The following extracts are taken from this edition of 1634.

First, on the question, "*Whether the Sacraments be seals of the promises of God,*" he thus speaks.

To the objection of Bellarmine, that "if the Sacraments are appointed to be seals of the promises of God for the increase and strengthening of our faith, then children should not be baptized at all, because they have no faith to be strengthened;" he replies,—

"Although in children the seal goeth before, and righteousness of faith followeth after, as Circumcision was to Isaac, as Augustine sheweth, and they as yet, when they are baptized, have no faith to make present use of the Sacrament, yet when they come to years of discretion, they are provoked and stirred up, by the remembrance of the seal of faith given in Baptism; which was indeed received but once, but the use and benefit thereof remaineth all the life long: so that this notwithstanding, the Sacraments are seals of faith, whether the seal go before faith or follow after."*

Then proceeding to give the doctrine of "the Protestants" on this point, he states it thus,—

"That the Sacraments are ordained of God, to be pledges and seals of his promises made unto us in Christ; that as verily as the external elements are applied to the outward man, so our souls spiritually are refreshed with an assured hope of the remission of our sins in Christ, and so the Sacraments to be seals only of the righteousness of faith, and not givers or workers of grace in us: it is evident out of the Scripture. . . . Abraham received the sign of circumcision, as the seal of the righteousness of faith. Circumcision then was to Abraham a seal of the righteousness of faith, that is, that he was justified by faith: *ergo*, so are all other Sacraments. . . . [And then, replying to the objection, that though it was so in the case of Abraham, who was just before, yet it followeth not that it was so in all; for in Isaac his son, and so consequently in the rest, the Sacrament went before, and justice followed—he adds, among other remarks,] Although Isaac with many other were first circumcised and after justified, yet this is perpetual;

---

hath utterly relinquished the same, and that thereupon few or none at all of the said Books are to be had and gotten; and that also, by reason of the great price and value of the said Book, *many of the clergy of this our kingdom are not able to purchase or procure the same;* wherefore the said Paule Willett," &c., concluding with granting him the "privilege for the sole reprinting thereof," for 21 years. (Rymer's Fœdera, vol. xix. pp. 161, 162.)

* Controv. xi. Quest. 1. pt. 4. p. 538.

they were no more justified by circumcision, than Abraham, who was justified before he was circumcised, but by faith only: and therefore the Sacraments are seals of the justice of faith, whether the justice of faith go before or follow after."*

Again, on the question, "*whether the Sacraments* OF THEMSELVES *do give or confer grace*," he thus speaks,—

The Popish doctrine, he says, is, that "the sacraments give grace, *ex opere operato*, by the work wrought, that is, by force and virtue of the work and word done and said in the Sacrament. Rhemist. Act. 22. sect. 1. So that not faith only justifieth, but the Sacraments also, and other works of religion. Rhemist. Rom. 6. sect. 5. The Sacraments, then, are immediate instruments and efficient causes of our justification, not mediately, as they nourish and increase our faith, but *properly and in themselves*"† &c.

And one of their arguments for this, he tells us, is,—"St. Paul saith, He hath cleansed his Church by the laver of water in the word, Ephes. v. 26. Ergo, Baptism is an instrumental cause of our justification:" to which he thus replies,—

"It is not unusual in the Scripture to call the sign or Sacrament by the thing signified, as Exod. xii. 11, the Paschal Lamb is called the Passover, whereas it was but a sign and memorial thereof. So Baptism is called, 'The laver of regeneration,' Tit. iii. 5, because it is a sure sign of our regeneration by the Holy Ghost. Secondly, the Apostle in this place expoundeth himself: for he saith, that we are washed by water in the word: that is, the outward element doth send and refer us to the word and the promise of God, whereof it is a seal."‡

He then proceeds to state the doctrine of the Protestants on this point in the following words,—

"The Sacraments have no power to give or confer grace to the receiver: [that is, he means, "*of themselves*"] neither are they immediate instruments of our justification: instrumental means they are to increase and confirm our faith in the promises of God: of themselves they have no operation, but as the Spirit of God worketh by them, our internal senses being moved and quickened by those external objects. Neither do we say, that the Sacraments are bare and naked signs of spiritual graces: but they do verily exhibit and

* Controv. xi. Quest. 1. p. 539. † Ibid. Quest. 2. pt. 1. p. 540.
‡ Ibid. p. 541.

represent Christ to as many as by faith are able and meet to apprehend him. So to conclude, look how the word of God worketh being preached, so do the Sacraments; but the word doth no otherwise justify us, but by working faith at the hearing thereof: so Sacraments do serve for the increase of our faith. . . . The just shall live by faith: *ergo*, he liveth not, that is, he is not justified by any work wrought, as by the sacraments, but only by faith: faith therefore giveth life and efficacy to the sacraments. . . . The apostle sheweth, Rom. iv. 10, 11, that righteousness was imputed to Abraham by faith, before he was circumcised, and that circumcision was added afterward as a seal of the righteousness of faith: *ergo*, as Abraham was not justified by circumcision, but by faith, no more are we by the sacraments."*

On the question "of the difference of the Old and New Sacraments," he says, among other remarks,—

"The sacraments of the New Law are no more able by any efficacy in themselves to justify us, than the sacraments of the Old: it is the property of faith only to justify us, Rom. iii. 28, and chap. v. 1. 'Being justified by faith, we are at peace with God.' Where it cannot be answered, that faith justifieth but in part, for that is perfect justification which worketh peace of conscience in us; but faith bringeth such justification; *ergo*, it justifieth perfectly. Therefore in this respect, the sacraments differ not, because neither of them justify, but are seals only of the righteousness of faith, Rom. xi. 4."†

"We do hold and constantly affirm and teach, that the Fathers in the Law received no less the truth and substance of Christ by faith in their Sacraments than we do in ours: although in respect of more clear and lightsome signification, our Sacraments do far exceed theirs, and so also may more lively stir up our faith: yet the substance and effect both of their Sacraments and ours was all one and the very same."‡

"We say not that circumcision caused remission of sins: for then the effect could not go before the cause; but that it was a seal of the righteousness of faith, as the apostle saith, Rom. iv. 11, and of remission of sins: and so it may be, whether righteousness go before circumcision, as in Abraham, or follow after, as in Isaac. So we read, Acts x. 47, that the Holy Ghost went before, and then Baptism followed: the thing signified appeared first, and then the sign or seal was added."§

---

* Controv. xi. quest. 2, p. 541.
† Ib. pt. 2, p. 543.
‡ Ib. p. 544.
§ Ib. p. 545.

In noticing the view of the Sacrament of Baptism imprinting a character or badge upon the soul, he remarks,—

"Baptism is not reiterable, that is, to be iterated or repeated, not because it leaveth an indelible character in the mind of the baptized, which is but a mere device and fancy; but because, as it sufficeth once to be born in the flesh, so once to be born again, and to be regenerated by the Spirit (*of the which regeneration Baptism is a seal and pledge*), it is sufficient."*

On the question "of the necessity of the Sacraments," he remarks,—

"Though the sacraments being appointed for our comfort are necessary and profitable as wholesome means to be used for the increase of our faith, and much to be desired and sought for: yet God hath not laid such a necessity upon any of them, as that the want of them should cause hazard of salvation. . . . A necessity of the sacraments we grant, as also of other profitable means, as of preaching the word, of prayer, or the like: but no simple and absolute necessity, as we have said; neither are the sacraments necessary at all to any such purpose (being ordained for no such use) as to be a means to faith, as St. Paul concludeth, Rom. iii. 28, that a man 'is justified by faith only, without works of the Law:' yea, all works whatsoever are excluded, as destroying grace, Rom. xi. ver. 6. The sacraments are profitable instruments to stir up the gift of faith, and other graces in us, but not by their proper work to justify us."†

Further; treating more expressly on the subject of Baptism, he first takes up the question "of the name and definition of Baptism;" and he says,—

"They (the Papists) define Baptism to be a Sacrament of regeneration by water in the word: that is, not which signifieth and sealeth unto us our regeneration, and assureth us of remission of sins; but actually justifieth and regenerateth us. Bellarm. lib. 1. de Baptism. cap. 1.

"*Argum.* Bellarmine groundeth his definition upon those words of our Saviour, John iii. 5, 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit:' and Ephes. v. 26, 'That he might sanctify it by the washing of water through the word.' Hence he would infer that we are sanctified by the water in Baptism. Bellarm. ibid.

* Controv. xi. quest. 2, pt. 3, p. 547. † Ibid. quest. 3, pt. 4, p. 551.

"*Ans.* It is manifest by those places, where the Spirit and the word are joined to the outward washing by water, that the efficacy is not in the water but in the Spirit, and the word or promise of God which is *apprehended by faith:* these places prove that baptism is *a Sacrament, sign and seal of regeneration, but no efficient or working cause thereof*..... If they will be tried by Tertullian, he is against them: in that book alleged he saith, 'quam fides impetrat, obsignata in Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto: which (washing away of sins) faith obtaineth, being sealed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, &c.' He ascribeth the washing away of sins not to the water, but to faith: and yet more evidently in another place, 'lavacrum illud obsignatio est fidei,' that lavacre is a sealing of faith: 'non ideo abluimur ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desiimus, quia corde jam loti sumus:' we are not therefore washed that we may leave off to sin, but because we have left already, because we are washed in heart, &c. *Baptism then doth not actually justify or regenerate, seeing such as come to be baptized, believed and were regenerate already.*

"We (the Protestants) rather, according to the Scriptures, define Baptism to be a sign or seal of our regeneration and new birth, whereby we are assured, that as verily by faith in the blood of Christ we are cleansed from our sins, as our bodies are washed with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; so that baptism doth not actually bestow remission of sins by the work wrought, but is a pledge and seal of the righteousness of faith, as Saint Paul saith of circumcision, Rom. iv. 11. For it is not the washing of the flesh by water, but the establishing of the heart with faith and grace, that saveth us, 1 Pet. iii. 21."*

On the question "of the necessity of Baptism," he writes thus,—

"We acknowledge no greater necessity in Baptism, than in the other Sacrament: both which we grant to be necessary as helps and props, and profitable means to increase our faith: but not so simply necessary, as that without them (there being no neglect, or contempt had of them) it were impossible to be saved..... The children of the faithful are holy already, even before they be baptized: for they are within the covenant, and to them also belongeth the promise. The Lord saith, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, Genes. xvii. 7. And Saint Paul saith, that the children of the faithful are holy, 1 Cor. vii. 14. If the Lord then be the God also of children, and if they be holy, being born of the righteous seed, how can they possibly perish, although they die unbaptized?"†

---

* Controv. xii. quest. 1. pp. 561, 562. † Ibid. quest. 3. p. 565.

"Neither Circumcision then, nor Baptism now, is a remedy against original sin, but a sign only and seal of our spiritual washing by the blood of Christ."*

On the question "of such as are to be admitted to Baptism," he writes thus;—

"Baptism they [the Papists] say, giveth grace and faith to the infant that had none before, Rhemist. Galat. 3. sect. 6. This then is their opinion, that infants, though actually and fully they have not faith as other have, yet there is a certain habit of faith and hope infused into them in Baptism; so that partly they do believe of themselves, and partly by the faith of others, namely, of them that bring them to Baptism. Bellarm. lib. 1, de baptism. cap. 11.

"*Argum.* Without faith it is impossible to please God. Heb. xi. 6; Rom. iii. 28. We hold that a man is justified by faith: *ergo*, children, if they have no faith, are neither justified, neither yet do please God: (Ephes. iii. 1.) Christ dwelleth in our hearts by faith: but he dwelleth in children; *ergo*, they have faith. Bellarm.

"*Answ.* First, these places do as well prove that children have an absolute, perfect, and actual faith (for it is a perfect faith that justifieth us, and maketh us acceptable to God): which I am sure our adversaries will not yield unto. Secondly, *the justification and salvation of children dependeth of the free election of God, Rom. ix.* 11, *that the purpose of God might remain according to election, saith the Apostle.* And that which faith worketh in those that are of understanding, the Spirit of God is able to effect in infants, by some secret way best known to himself."†

"Infants are not justified, nor relieved, or helped forward towards their salvation by the faith of their parents or godfathers, when they are baptized: for the Scripture saith, The just shall live by faith, Rom. i. 17, that is, by his own faith, not the faith of another.

"Bellarmine answereth, that they do not affirm that children are justified, or do live by the faith of their parents, and of others, but that their faith is profitable to the infants, being by this means brought unto Baptism, and because they do profess their faith in Baptism by the mouth of others. Bellarm. cap. 11. propos. 5.

"*Contra.* First, that it is a benefit to be born of faithful parents, who are careful to bring their infants to be baptized, and to see them well brought up, we grant: but what is this to the state of infants before God? Secondly, the confession of their faith by others is profitable, to put them afterward in remembrance of their solemn

* Controv. xii. quest. 3. p. 567. † Ibid. quest. 5. p. 574.

promise made in Baptism; but before God, they are no more helped by the confession of another's mouth, than by the belief of another's heart: wherefore it is not either the faith of the parents, or the confession of the witnesses, that supplieth the lack of both in infants, but *the grace of God inwardly working.*"*

On the question, "Whether in Baptism our sins be clean taken away," occurs the following remark:—

"*Wherefore the elect in Baptism find remission of sins for ever, so that their sins are no more imputed unto them; the rest do not at all obtain that grace.*"†

Lastly, on the question, "Whether Baptism serve only for remission of sins past, and not for the sins also to come," he makes the following, among other statements:—

"The external act of Baptism neither wipeth away sins going before, nor coming after: but it is the inward working of the Spirit of God, which [is] by the virtue of Christ's death *testified and showed forth in Baptism*, that washeth away our sins. And Baptism is a seal of remission of sins, for the confirmation of our faith, even of those which are committed after Baptism, as well as of sins done before: and although the ceremony of Baptism be not repeated, yet the virtue of God's grace testified thereby remaineth to our lives end.

"*Argum.* 1. Mark xvi. 16: 'He that shall believe and be baptized shall be saved.' We reason thus,—Baptism is *a seal of that faith* whereby men are saved, or to the which salvation is promised: but that faith believeth remission of all sins both past and to come: therefore Baptism also sealeth unto us the remission of all our sins, going before or following after. And here is no other thing required, but for a man to believe, and to apprehend God's covenant made in Baptism."‡

"*Argum.* 2. The promise of Baptism is, 'That we being justified by his grace, should be made heirs of eternal life,' Tit. iii. 5, 7. But this promise of justification is general against all sins before Baptism, and after: *ergo*, so is Baptism.

"Bellarmine answereth, that justification by Christ is promised as well in the Eucharist as in Baptism; and therefore it followeth not, that they which after their fall are justified by Christ, are justified by Baptism.

"*Contra.* We grant that justification by Christ is exhibited in both the Sacraments, and that both of them, as Sacraments, are

* Controv. xii. quest. 5. p. 574.
† Ibid. quest. 6. pt. 1. p. 578.
‡ Ibid. quest. 6. pt. 2. p. 579.

remedies against sins committed afterward: so then the argument thus followeth very well. Justification by Christ is a remedy against all our sins whatsoever: *Baptism is a seal of Justification by Christ: ergo*, it is *available for remission of all sins.* We do not infer Baptism only as a seal thereof, which Bellarmine supposeth, neither do we conclude, that Baptism only is available: it is sufficient that Baptism hath this virtue and efficacy, together with other helps and remedies, as to extend itself to the sins of the whole life.

"*Argum.* 3. *Baptism is a sign and seal of our mystical washing in the blood of Christ:* but all our sins both before and after are washed away by the blood of Christ: *ergo*, Baptism doth assure us of a perfect remission of all our sins.

* * * * * * *

"Bellarmine answereth. . . . that Baptism, though not immediately, yet mediately serveth to purge sins done afterward, because he that is baptized, by that grace which he received in Baptism, obtaineth remission of sins. c. 18, lib. 1. de baptism.

"*Contra.* First, neither do we say, that Baptism worketh immediately, for the sacraments are instruments and means of grace, and so mediate workers. Secondly, as he confesseth the sins following to be remitted in Baptism, *no otherwise* are the sins past, but by the grace of Christ *sealed unto him that is baptized in baptism.*"*

The doctrine expressed, directly or indirectly, in all these passages, on the subject of our present inquiry, is of course too clear to need any remark.

THOMAS ROGERS. 1607.

Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft.

The following extracts are from his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, published with a dedication to Archbishop Bancroft in 1607,† and *which the Archbishop directed all the parishes in*

* Ibid p. 580.

† There was an earlier edition of the work in 1585—1587, but there were many alterations and additions in the work as published in 1607 and dedicated to the Archbishop. The doctrine, however, remained precisely the same. The title of the first edition was, "The Englsh Creede, consenting with the true Auncient Catholique and Apostolique Church in al the Points and Articles of Religion which everie Christian is to knowe and beleeve that would be saved, &c. Lond. J. Windet. 1585." fol. The same. Part 2. Lond. R. Waldegrave. 1587. fol. The First Part contains

*his Province to supply themselves with.** This work, therefore, must be considered as having had a certain degree of public authority given to it. It is the earliest Exposition of the Articles ever published.

From the exposition of the 25th Article.

The third proposition he deduces from this Article is the following:—

"By the sacraments God doth quicken, strengthen, and confirm our faith in him." (p. 146.)

On which he remarks,—

"Howbeit this faith is not necessarily tied unto the visible signs and sacraments. For,

"Without the sacraments many have lived and died who pleased God, and are no doubt saved. . . .

"Some have faith for [afore] they receive any of the sacraments. . . .

"Some neither afore, nor at the instant, nor yet afterward, though daily they receive the sacraments, will have faith. . . .

"In some the sacraments do effectuall work in process of time, by the help of God's word read or preached, which engendereth faith; *such is the estate principally of infants elected unto life and salvation and increasing in years.*" (p. 147.)

"Therefore do they err, which teach or hold, that

"They never go to heaven which die without the seals of the covenant; so think the Papists of infants which die unbaptized.

"The sacraments give grace *ex opere operato*, and bring faith *ex opere operato*. (Test. Rhem. An. Mar. p. 357.)

"The sacrament of Baptism is cause of the salvation of infants. (Ib. An. 1 Pet. v. 21.)" (pp. 147, 148.)

The 11th proposition he draws from this Article is,—

"All which receive the sacraments receive not therewithal the things signified by the sacraments." (p. 159.)

---

the first XIX Articles; the Second Part contains the remainder. The title of the enlarged edition, published in 1607, with the dedication to Archbishop Bancroft, and frequently reprinted, is,—"The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion professed and protected in the Realm of England and dominions of the same, expressed in XXXIX Articles, &c., the same Articles analyzed," &c. "Perused, and by the lawfull authoritie of the Church of England allowed to be publike." 4to.

* See p. 100 above.

On which he observes,—

"We read in the Holy Scripture, that some persons do receive the sacraments, and the things signified by the sacraments, which are the remission of sins and other spiritual graces from God. . . .

"Some again receive the sacraments, but not the things by them signified. . . .

"And some receive not the sacraments at all, and yet are partakers of the things by the sacraments signified. . . .

"Furthermore it is apparent, how salvation is promised to such as are baptized, yet not simply in respect of their baptism, but if they do believe. . . .

"The Papists therefore be in a wrong opinion which deliver that "The sacraments are *not only seals, but also causes of grace*, and "The sacraments do give grace even because they be delivered and received, *ex opere operato*." (pp. 159, 160.)

From the exposition of the 27th Article.

He considers this Article as containing the following propositions:—

"1. Baptism is a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are discerned from other men that be no Christians.

"2. Baptism is a sign or seal of the regeneration or new birth of Christians.

"3. Infants, and young children, by the word of God, are to be baptized." (p. 165.)

On the second proposition he observes,—

"Baptism of St. Paul is called the washing of the new birth, of others the sacrament of the new birth, to signify how *they which rightly* (AS ALL DO NOT) *receive the same* (see afore, art. 25, prop. 11)* are engrafted into the body of Christ, as by a seal be assured from God, that their sins be pardoned and forgiven, and themselves adopted for the children of God, confirmed in the faith, and do increase in grace, by virtue of prayer unto God.

"And this is the constant doctrine of *all* Churches, Protestant and Reformed." (p. 167.)

"We also condemn the opinion

---

* The proposition here referred to is one quoted above, namely, that "all which receive the sacraments receive not therewithal the things signified by the sacraments," a proposition he deduces from the 25th Article.

"Of the Russies, that there is such a necessity of baptism, as that all that die without the same are damned.

* * * * * * *

"And lastly of the Papists, who maintain that,

"Baptism bringeth grace, even *ex opere operato*." (pp. 167, 168.)

And in his commentary upon the 17th Article, deducing from the Article the proposition that "they which are predestinate unto salvation cannot perish," he observes,—

"Wander then do they from the truth which think, That *the regenerate may fall from the grace of God*, may destroy the temple of God, and be broken off from the vine Christ Jesus." (p. 74.)

This passage of course proves, that he held, that all that are once spiritually regenerated are saved.

DR. THOMAS SPARKE. 1607.

The following extracts are from a work written to promote unity and uniformity, and "seen, allowed, and commanded by public authority to be printed;"*

First, let us observe his views of the nature of Sacraments generally, where we shall find that he quite admits their efficacy in the case of worthy receivers of them.

"All Sacraments by Christ's own ordinance not only signify the spiritual things whereof they are Sacraments, but also are God's ordinary means, whereby he doth offer, deliver, and seal the delivery thereof, to all the worthy receivers of the same." (Dr. T. Sparke's Brotherly Persuasion to Unity and Uniformity. Seen allowed and commanded by public authority to be printed. Lond. 1607, 4to. p. 30. Cambr. Univ. Libr. Ff. 13, 34.)

---

* Dr. Sparke had appeared at the Hampton Court Conference as one of the defenders of the parties objecting to some parts of the Prayer-Book, but, satisfied with the alterations then made and the arguments there adduced, he afterwards wrote the work quoted above in defence of unity and uniformity, which came out under the sanction of *public authority*, and therefore is of course of considerable weight. He is spoken of by Wood (Ath. Ox. ii. 189.), no friend to his views, as "a learned man and solid divine," and "much esteemed for his profoundness, gravity, and exemplary life and conversation." More particulars respecting him will be found in my "Vindication of the Thirty-nine Articles," 2nd ed. App.

"Sacraments properly taken are not only signs of some spiritual grace, but of saving grace in Christ Jesus: and they are means also to offer, to deliver, and to seal the delivery of the same, to the *right receivers* thereof." (Ib. p. 74.)

The following passages will show his view of the meaning of the Baptismal Service for infants; a view authorized, we must recollect, by public authority.

"Immediately before the act of the baptizing of it [i. e. 'the child'], the minister prayeth that whosoever there shall be dedicated unto God by his office and ministry (meaning in baptizing them) may be endued with heavenly virtues, and everlastingly rewarded through his mercy: and then having baptized it or them, *in faith and hope that this prayer is heard*, and so, that they are by, and in baptism, substantially and effectually dedicated unto God, *Amen* is said: after follows the minister's and people's admittance of them, and signing of them, as aforesaid: which is nothing but an approving of the former dedication as much as lies in them, and a declaring of their *hope and expectation* by that which they do, that in time they will show and manifest themselves to be dedicated to his service indeed, in faithfully serving of him both in belief and life." (Ib. pp. 28, 29. See also pp. 23, 24.)

"Thus therefore in the name of the child they [the Godparents] professing and desiring, what is it but, in the true meaning of the book, *in Christian charity and hope so to do*, for that they are persuaded that if the child were of age, it would even so do, profess, and desire? And therefore that they in the meantime, do so in the name thereof, in full expectation, that when it shall, it will account that by them itself so did, that *so* the covenant betwixt God and it, may in this Sacrament stand ratified therein. And yet in some sense according to Christ's saying, Matth. 18, it might well be defended, that such little ones believe in him, as habitually they are reasonable, not actually: or for that it may well be *hoped*, they have *the seed of faith*, or the spirit of sanctification, disposing and preparing them thereunto, though secretly, yet effectually working the same." (Ib. p. 59.)

And meeting the objection to the statement that the Sacrament of Baptism is generally necessary to salvation, he says,—

"Only hereby would the State take order as much as might be (which was very necessary) to prevent all contempt or neglect thereof, if it could in time be had: for as the one extreme is to be avoided, so doubtless was and is the other: and so for any thing our Church hath done in this point, the ancient doctrine that always hath

in this case been held and received of and in the Churches of Christ, since the first institution of the Sacraments, namely, not the want thereof simply, but the contempt or neglect thereof to be damnable, is held here still, and therefore this of baptism is to be counted so necessary to salvation, as that by all means when and where (as is aforesaid) it may be had, it is most carefully and diligently to be sought for." (Ib. pp. 72, 73.)

And on the rubric that children dying in their infancy after baptism are undoubtedly saved, he observes,—

"Now whereas I hear that some stumble at that, that the child dying after baptism before yet it can be confirmed, it is said in the book (immediately before the Catechism, in a rubric there) that such a child hath all things necessary by the word of God to salvation, and is undoubtedly saved, gathering thereupon that the meaning of our Church therein is absolutely and simply so to tie salvation to baptism, that whosoever once is outwardly baptized cannot but be saved: surely this is as hard a collection and construction of this as may be. For first it is evident that there the speech is of baptized children only dying before they be confirmed; and that of purpose it is there so set down, to the comfort of Christian parents in that case, and plainly to teach us all, howsoever our Church thinks it fit to retain the use of confirmation in sundry good respects, yet it holds it not to be of the same nature with the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, nor so necessary to salvation. And what reason is there to the contrary, but that we may and ought, in Christian charity, so hope and persuade ourselves of all Christian children so baptized, dying in their childhood, as that Book speaketh?" (Ib. p. 73.)

LORD CHANCELLOR BACON; *died a.* 1626.

I will add one more testimony, from the writings of one of the greatest minds this or any other country ever gave birth to, —Francis Bacon.

Thus he speaks in his "Confession of Faith:"—

"That he [God] chose (according to his good pleasure), man to be that creature, to whose nature the Person of the eternal Son of God should be united; and amongst the generations of men elected a small flock, in whom (by the participation of himself) he purposed to express the riches of his glory; all the ministration of angels,

damnation of devils and reprobates, and universal administration of all creatures, and dispensation of all times, having no other end, but as the ways and ambages of God, to be further glorified in his saints, who are one with their Head the Mediator, who is one with God."—

"That the sufferings and merits of Christ, as they are sufficient to do away the sins of the whole world, so they are only effectual to those which are *regenerate by the Holy Ghost;* WHO BREATHETH WHERE HE WILL OF FREE GRACE; which grace, as a seed incorruptible, quickeneth the spirit of man, and conceiveth him anew a son of God and member of Christ; so that Christ having man's flesh, and man having Christ's spirit, there is an open passage and mutual imputation; whereby sin and wrath was conveyed to Christ from man, and merit and life is conveyed to man from Christ: which seed of the Holy Ghost first figureth in us the image of Christ slain or crucified, through a lively faith; and then reneweth in us the image of God in holiness and charity; though both imperfectly, and in degrees far differing even in God's elect, as well in regard of the fire of the Spirit, as of the illumination thereof; which is more or less in a large proportion: as namely, in the Church before Christ; which yet nevertheless was partaker of one and the same salvation with us, and of one and the same means of salvation with us.

"That the work of the Spirit, though it be *not tied to any means in heaven or earth,* yet it is ordinarily dispensed by the preaching of the word, the administration of the Sacraments, the covenants of the fathers upon the children, prayer, reading, the censures of the Church, the society of the godly, the cross and afflictions, God's benefits, his judgments upon others, miracles, the contemplation of his creatures: all which, though some be more principal, God useth as the means of vocation and conversion *of his elect;* not derogating from his power to call immediately by his grace, and at all hours and moments of the day, that is, of man's life, according to his good pleasure."

* * * * * * *

"That there is an universal or Catholic Church of God, dispersed over the face of the earth, which is Christ's spouse and Christ's body; being gathered of the Fathers of the old world, of the Church of the Jews, of the spirits of the faithful dissolved, and the spirits of *the faithful militant,* and of the names yet to be born, *which are already written in the book of life.* That there is ALSO *a visible Church,* distinguished by the outward works of God's covenant, and the receiving of the holy doctrine, with *the use of the mysteries of God,* and the invocation and sanctification of his holy name."*

* Works, ed. Lond. 1819. 8vo. vol. 2. pp. 482 and 486, 487.

Here we find the powerful and acute mind, not of a divine, but of a lawyer, and that lawyer Lord Chancellor Bacon, taking precisely the same view of the doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Church of England, that is now ridiculed under the name of Calvinism. He draws a marked distinction between the Catholic Church, which is Christ's true body, and the visible Church; and holds the members of the former only to be regenerate by the Holy Spirit, who "breatheth where he will, of free grace."

Here I close my list of authorities for the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England during this, the first, and in this inquiry the most important, period of her existence. And I need hardly say, that our Articles and Formularies, as it respects the subject before us, remaining to this day, (with unimportant exceptions), the same as they were during the time when the above testimonies were written, the doctrine which they have delivered as the doctrine of our Church, has, to say the least, the best claim upon our acceptance. And while there is, no doubt, some difference in the precise views of the divines from whom I have quoted, on the subject of Baptism, (agreeing with the remarks I have made above in the first chapter of this work) yet there is not one of them that holds that spiritual regeneration is, in all cases, conferred upon infants in baptism. And almost all of them take what is called the "Calvinistic" view, and make the gift of such regeneration to depend altogether upon God's free mercy; the leading doctrines of the "Calvinistic" system of theology, (speaking generally,) being, as I have already proved, the dominant theology in our Church at that time.

That a party holding different views arose in our Church afterwards, and that, under the guidance of such men as Laud and Mountagu and others, they introduced among us a totally different system of doctrine, and consequently a totally different mode of interpreting our Formularies, is very true. True also is it, that when this party had *begun* to prevail in the Church at the *beginning* of the 17th century, especially when they had power to make their interpretation of its Formularies the rule of orthodoxy, the phraseology of the Baptismal Service became (and not *till* then, be it observed, *did* it become, *in the point now in question,*) the object of suspicion and dislike to some among us. Before this period, we

do not find the Puritans themselves complaining of the phrases to which they afterwards so strenuously objected. The sense in which they were understood by the authorities of the Church, was well known, and probably also the approval of such men as Martyr and Bucer to their insertion in the Liturgy clearly remembered, and therefore they gave rise to no scruple, no remonstrance. But when the prevailing tone of doctrine in our Church began to change, and it was found that these expressions were taken in an unorthodox sense, then the feeling respecting them was very naturally changed. And as a new generation rose up, *many of whom knew little of the literature of a preceding age*, it was likely enough that some should be misled by expressions capable of different interpretations, and imagine the doctrine of our Church to be different from what it really is; especially when they found a certain sense affixed to these expressions by a large party in the Church, and were themselves perhaps not disinclined to find the Church guilty of false doctrine. True also is it, that when, after the Great Rebellion, the Laudian party were again in the ascendant, the Bishops that met at the Savoy Conference in 1661, not only refused the request of those who afterwards became Nonconformists to alter those expressions, but to a certain extent vindicated the Laudian and Romanizing interpretation of these phrases; and that from that day to this there may have been a considerable body of our divines, (though after all only a portion), who have taken the same view. All this is, no doubt, very true. But what does it amount to? Simply that during a long period in the *later history* of our Reformed Church, our Formularies have been interpreted by a portion, and sometimes the dominant portion, of our divines, in a different way from what those who drew them up intended they should be. How far this may go to justify those who place such a sense upon them, is a question into which I shall not enter. But which interpretation has the *best claim* upon the members of our Church for their acceptance, cannot (I submit) admit of a doubt. Had *new* Formularies been drawn up by Convocation at that time, and such new Formularies been accepted and sanctioned by Parliament, the case would have been wholly different. But the Formularies (with exceptions unimportant as far as this point is concerned) remained the same; and were sanctioned by Parliament *as such*. For the

Act of Uniformity expressly sanctions the Book of Common Prayer, AS THE BOOK DRAWN UP "IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE LATE QUEEN ELIZABETH," *with a few "additions and alterations"* made by the Convocation then sitting. All that we are here concerned with was confirmed by Parliament as Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book, and, for aught we know, confirmed in the sense in which it was originally adopted.

Nor indeed have we any declaration of *the Convocation* of 1662, as to the sense of any part of the Liturgy. What passed at the Savoy Conference, was merely an expression of the judgment of the few Bishops and divines appointed to conduct the Conference, a Conference which *broke up without effecting anything*. Neither Convocation nor Parliament did anything more than re-issue Queen Elizabeth's Book of Common Prayer with a few additions and alterations.

The proofs for this statement I shall supply in a future chapter.

I now proceed, in the following chapters, to consider the language of our Articles, Homilies, and Book of Common Prayer, relative to the point of doctrine discussed in this work.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DOCTRINE OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES, AND THE BOOK OF HOMILIES, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

§ 1. *The doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles.*

In proceeding to consider the testimony of the Thirty-nine Articles, I would first call the attention of the reader to the mode in which they deal with the subject of our present inquiry. It will be found that they have treated it precisely as Holy Scripture has treated it. They have laid down the general doctrine on the subject of Baptism, in words more expressly referring to the case of adults, leaving the case of infants to be deduced therefrom by analogy.

The case of adults was that with which the first teachers of Christianity had more especially to deal, and to which therefore their words more particularly refer. Our Church here, as in other matters, follows closely the footsteps of Holy Scripture, confining her determinations to what is there plainly expressed. This is proved by the phraseology used, as I shall immediately show. And the *general doctrine* on the subject having thus been laid down, agreeably to the declarations of Holy Scripture, the particular case of infants is left to be inferred therefrom. The doctrine of the effects of baptism in infants is *not left undetermined,* so far as regards certain *limits* being placed to our views, both on one side and the other, respecting it. For *the general doctrine* has been *clearly laid down ;* and our view of this particular case must be agreeable thereto. A salutary reception

of the Sacraments being limited, by the 25th Article, to a worthy reception, our theory, whatever it may be, touching the case of infants, must be founded upon this view. But as there are various ways in which the case of infants may be viewed in perfect consistency with this general doctrine, so there is scope left by the Articles for some variety of view as to the operation of baptism in the case of infants. And how far this latitude extends, I have already endeavoured to show in the first Chapter.* It appears to me that our Reformers have expressly avoided giving any precise dogmatic statement as to the way in which baptism works in infants; for in the only passage in the Articles in which the subject of Infant Baptism is alluded to, all that is stated is, that "the baptism of infants is to be retained;"† and this after a general statement of the doctrine of Baptism, which, in some at least of its terms, can hardly be more than inferentially and analogically applied to the case of infants.

Let us observe the phraseology of Articles 25, 26, and 27. In Article 25, it is said,—

"Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm, *our faith in him*. . . . In such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith."

Now here, not only do the words show,‡ that the case *more particularly* in view was that of adults, but the joint reference in these words to *both* the Sacraments renders it necessary so to understand them, because, in our Church, adults only partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The effect of baptism in the case of infants can only be deduced *inferentially* from these words.

---

* See pp. 4—7, above. † See Art. 27.

‡ I say the words show this, because although a few divines at the earliest period of our Reformed Church did, clearly, adopt the view of Luther, that infants might have faith, yet it will, I suppose, be universally admitted, that this was not the view of those principally concerned in drawing up our Articles. It is of course *admissible* under our Articles, but that is a different question.

The same course is pursued in the next Article, entitled, "Of the unworthiness of the ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments," where it is said,

"Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as *by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments* ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men."

Here again, some of the words used apply more particularly to the case of adults, but the statement *involves* that of infants, and the doctrine is of most importance in respect of their case. For, almost all being baptized in infancy, it is of more importance to know that the unworthiness of the minister does not hinder the effect of baptism in *them*, than that it does not in the case of adults. The words therefore must be applied, so far as the analogy of the two cases will bear out the application, to the case of infants.

The phraseology of the 27th Article, "Of baptism," is clearly of the same kind. It runs thus,—

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened; but is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed: *faith is confirmed and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.*"

And then it is added with respect to Infant Baptism,—

"The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

Now the "confirmation of faith," in the strict and full sense of the words, can only take place in adults.

But still, here is a *certain doctrine* laid down, which, in its general principles, includes the case of infants as well as adults. As there is a right or worthy, and an unworthy, reception of baptism in the case of adults, so there is *a corresponding difference* of reception in the case of infants; whether we adopt the supposition of the difference arising from the grace of election or

the grace of sanctification having been bestowed on some, while others are left in that state of guilt and condemnation and consequent unfitness in which all are by nature; or whether we suppose the difference to arise from the foreknown difference of the reception given in after life to the declarations and promises of the Gospel; or whether we take any other view of the matter. And to say, in direct opposition to these general statements of the Church's doctrine on the subject of Baptism, that all infants are worthy recipients, and necessarily have spiritual regeneration given them in baptism, when all are declared by our Church to be by nature the children of wrath, is to make an assertion *directly opposed to the express dogmatic teaching of the Articles.* A general doctrine on the subject of the Sacraments is laid down by them, without any exception of the case of infants (which nevertheless was in their contemplation) from its operation, and therefore their case must be determined agreeably to the principles upon which that doctrine is founded.

But let us note the Bishop of Exeter's criticism upon this Article. He tells us that "in the 27th Article we read, that 'they that receive baptism rightly' have the whole spiritual grace of the Sacrament;" and in a note, that "the word rectè manifestly refers to baptism having been *rightly ministered* to the baptized," that is (as he goes on to explain), with the right words and matter; and he adds, "This point is further illustrated by the words of the Latin Article 19,—'Sacramenta ..... juxta Christi institutum *rectè* administrantur:' '*duly* ministered,' English Article 19."*

Now I will not stop to point out the (as it appears to me) very "manifest" error of making the word *right*, when connected with the *reception* of the Sacrament, refer to the mode of *ministration*, and deducing an argument for this from the use of the word when used in connexion with one relating to the ministration of the Sacrament; but I would at once ask his Lordship how he can thus commit himself to a view which expressly contradicts both his own statement elsewhere and the 25th Article. If all those to whom baptism is administered with the right words and matter "have the whole spiritual grace of the Sacra

* Charge, 3rd ed. pp. 41, 42.

ment," then all adults so receiving baptism have that grace, contrary to his Lordship's own doctrine* and to the 25th Article. So that the explanation is in every way most unfortunate. The very assertion made by the Bishop himself, that the Article says that "they that receive baptism rightly" have the whole spiritual grace of the Sacrament," necessitates the understanding of the word "rectè," "rightly," as applying to the state of the party receiving, not the mode of administration. And such I humbly think (independently of this) is the sense which alone the words "right *reception*" will bear.

And so they are explained by all the earlier Expositors of the Articles.

Thus Rogers,† paraphrasing the Article, says,—

"Baptism of St. Paul is called the washing of the new birth, of others the Sacrament of the new birth, to signify how they which *rightly* (AS ALL DO NOT) *receive the same*, are ingrafted into the body of Christ," &c. (On Art. 27.)

So Welchman (whose exposition of the Articles has always been in the highest repute) explains the words, "they that receive baptism rightly" ("recte baptismum suscipientes,") —"that is, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, *together with a solemn profession of faith and repentance*," ("*i. e.* in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, *una cum seria fidei et resipiscentiæ professione.*") (p. 28. ed. 1713.)

And this exposition is repeated from Welchman by Ford and Vencer, the next annotators on the Articles. And the same view is clearly implied in the Exposition of Bishop Burnet, who says,—

"Since it is the answer of a good conscience only that saves, then an answer from a bad conscience, from a hypocritical person, who does not inwardly think or purpose, according to what he professes outwardly, cannot save, but does on the contrary aggravate his damnation. Therefore our Article puts the efficacy of baptism, in order to the forgiveness of our sins, and to our adoption and salvation, upon the virtue of prayer to God; that is, upon those vows and other acts of devotion that accompany them: so that when the seriousness of

* See Charge, 3rd ed. p. 41.

† The Faith, Doctrine, and Religion of England, expressed in the XXXIX Articles, &c. The edition used is that of Lond. 1625. 4to.

the mind accompanies the regularity of the action, then both the outward and inward effects of baptism are attained by it."*

I doubt if any but very recent expositors of the Articles can be found who give the words any other meaning.

And this sense alone makes them agree with the latter part of the sentence, where it is said that "*faith is* CONFIRMED," &c.

But there is also a very *remarkable* piece of philological criticism with which his Lordship has favoured us on the meaning of the word *suscipientes,* which he tells us implies "simple reception—even passive and unconscious—*susception,*" and is used for the purpose of expressing the reception of the rite by infants, and he contrasts it with the use of the word *percipere,* "involving both action and intention," which is always applied (he says) to the reception of the Lord's Supper, which belongs to adults only who can exercise faith, &c. Now the most obvious answer to his Lordship may be derived from his own explanation of the words; for the word *percipere,* "involving *action,*" is clearly not so correct a word to express the *reception* of baptism, (where in *all* cases *the* action is only on the part of the administrator,) as a phrase which implies *mere* or *passive* reception. Whether therefore adults or infants are spoken of, *suscipientes* is clearly more strictly correct than *percipientes.*

It is impossible to conceive a statement more entirely in accordance with the views of those whom the Bishop of Exeter is opposing, than that made in this Article. Let us proceed to analyze it.

We are told first that baptism is not only a sign of profession, &c., but also a sign of regeneration or new birth. Now this is what Calvin himself says of it. He tells us that the "thing represented" ("res figurata") in baptism is "regeneration" ("regeneratio") (Inst. iv. 16. 4.); and that in baptism "spiritual regeneration is represented" ("spiritualis regeneratio figuratur.") (Catechism.)

And he observes,—

"They who think that Baptism is nothing else but a symbol and mark by which we make profession of our religion among men, just as soldiers bear upon them the insignia of their commander as a

* On Art. 27. p. 379. ed. 1746.

mark of their profession, have not well considered what was the first principle in Baptism. And that is, that it is to be received by us in connexion with this promise,—'Whosoever shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved.'"*

And in his Catechism, answering the question, "Do you attribute nothing else to the water than that it is only a figure of Baptism?" ("Annon aliud aquæ tribuis nisi ut ablutionis tantùm sit figura?") he says,—

"I consider it to be a figure in such a way as that the reality is joined with it. For God, in promising his gifts to us, does not trifle with us. Therefore it is certain, that the pardon of sins and newness of life are both offered to us, and received by us, in baptism."†

It is added, that by this sign, "as by an instrument, they that receive baptism *rightly*" are made partakers of certain spiritual blessings, which are described to be these; first, they "are grafted into the Church;" secondly, "the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed;" thirdly, "faith is confirmed and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God." Far from telling us that Baptism is always accompanied by spiritual regeneration, it speaks of it as *the sign of regeneration*, and that by it *in certain specified cases* a particular effect is wrought; which effect moreover, as it concerns the inward and more important part of the work of regeneration, is described by the words *sealing*, *confirming*, and *increasing*, not *bestowing*. Now these are precisely the blessings which even Calvin himself ascribes to baptism when so received. He says,—

"Baptism is the sign of initiation by which *we are admitted into the society of the Church, that being engrafted into Christ, we may be reckoned among the sons of God* . . . But Baptism brings three things to our faith. . . . This is the first thing that is set forth to us

* Quibus visum est Baptismum non aliud esse quam *tesseram ac notam qua religionem nostram apud homines profitemur*, quo modo Imperatoris sui insignia præferunt milites in suæ professionis notam, ii quod primum erat in Baptismo non perpenderunt. Id vero est, quòd a nobis accipiendus sit cum hac promissione, Quicunque crediderint, et baptizati fuerint, salvos fore. (Inst. iv. 15. 1.)

† Sic figuram esse sentio ut simul annexa sit veritas. Neque enim, sua nobis dona pollicendo, nos Deus frustratur. Proinde et peccatorum veniam et vitæ novitatem offerri nobis in baptismo, et recipi a nobis certum est.

by the Lord, that it should be a symbol and testimony of our purgation: or (to express my meaning better) the *representation of a sealed deed, by which he assures us that all our sins are so blotted out, covered over, obliterated, as never to come into his sight nor to be remembered, nor imputed.* For he wills that all who shall believe be baptized *for the remission of sins.*"——"It brings us also another fruit, which shows us our mortification in Christ and our new life in him.... As the graff derives its substance and nutriment from the root into which it is ingrafted, so they who receive Baptism with the faith with which they ought to receive it, are truly sensible of the efficacy of the death of Christ, in the mortification of the flesh, as also at the same time of his resurrection, in the quickening of the Spirit."——"Lastly, *our faith receives also this profit from Baptism*, that it assuredly testifies to us, that we are not only implanted into the death and life of Christ, but so united to Christ himself as to be partakers of all his blessings," &c.*

"Unless we render the promises there offered to us of no avail by rejecting them, we are clothed with Christ, and *have the gift of his Spirit.*"†

Here, then, are precisely the same blessings attributed to baptism when "rightly received," which our Article attributes to it when so received. And I quote purposely from Calvin, in order to give, *at once*, a *decisive* proof that such expressions do not favour the Bishop's doctrine. There is not one syllable in the whole Article that favours the view that all infants necessarily receive in baptism the blessing of spiritual regeneration.

---

* Baptismus signum est initiationis quo *in Ecclesiæ cooptamur societatem*, ut, *Christo insiti*, inter *filios Dei* censeamur.... Tria autem adfert fidei nostræ Baptismus.... Hoc primum est quod nobis a Domino proponitur, ut symbolum sit nostræ purgationis ac documentum: vel (ut melius explicem quod volo) *instar signati cujusdam diplomatis, quo nobis confirmet peccata nostra omnia sic deleta, inducta, obliterata esse, ne unquam in conspectum suum veniant, ne commemorentur, ne imputentur.* Vult enim omnes qui crediderint baptizari *in remissionem peccatorum.* ——Alterum etiam fructum affert, qui nostram in Christo mortificationem nobis ostendit et novam in eo vitam.... Quemadmodum surculus substantiam alimentumque ducit a radice cui insitus est, ita qui Baptismum ea qua debent fide accipiunt, vere efficaciam mortis Christi sentiunt, in mortificatione carnis suæ; simul etiam resurrectionis, in vivificatione Spiritus. ——Postremò et *hanc e Baptismo utilitatem fides nostra accipit*, quòd certò nobis testificatur, non modo in mortem et vitam Christi nos insitos esse, sed sic ipsi Christo unitos ut omnium ejus bonorum participes simus, &c. (Instit. iv. 15. 1, 5, and 6.)

† Nisi promissiones illic nobis oblatas respuendo infructuosas reddimus, vestimur Christo, *ejusque Spiritu donamur.* (Catech.)

But in the application of these words to the case of infants, there is, and always will be, a difference of opinion in the Church. Neither Scripture nor our Articles have ruled the point, so as to shut up the ministers of our Church to one view; and herein, to my humble apprehension, our Reformers have shewn both their wisdom and charity. They have left the point where Scripture has left it. At the same time, enough is said in the Articles, as in Scripture, to shew that we are not justified in assuming that all infants are necessarily regenerated in Baptism. Our Articles distinctly maintain that the Sacraments have a wholesome effect only in those that receive them *worthily*. This general doctrine, then, we must keep in view, when we come to consider the case of infants. No infants are of themselves worthy. They are born in sin and the children of wrath. Their Christian parentage no doubt renders them, in one sense, proper recipients of the rite of baptism, but only in the same way that the parentage of the children of the Jews entitled them to circumcision, and the outward privileges of God's chosen people. They are no more necessarily acceptable in the sight of God when coming to baptism, than Esau was when he was circumcised. We cannot, then, consistently with our Articles, which confine the grace of the Sacraments to worthy recipients, so tie the grace of God to the Sacrament of Baptism when administered to an infant, as to maintain that *all* infants must necessarily be regenerated by it. And in considering the question, What corresponds in infant recipients of baptism to *worthiness* in adult recipients, men will take different views, according to the system of theology which they may adopt. The principal of these views I have already noticed in my first chapter, and therefore shall not again advert to them here.

But besides the statements in those Articles that are expressly on the subject of the Sacraments, there are also incidental notices relating to Baptism in other Articles which call for consideration, especially as they are pressed by the Bishop of Exeter and others as supplying evidence in favour of their view.

Thus in the 9th Article the words "them that believe and are baptized" are in the Latin "renatis et credentibus;" and in the English translation of the Articles published previously to our present authorized one, the word "renatis" in the former part of

the Article (now translated "regenerated") was translated "baptized." The comment of the Bishop of Exeter upon this, I give entire, in his own words.

"There remains one passage in the ninth Article, 'original or birth sin,' of which it should seem impossible, that any one not wilfully blind, should fail to see (whether he will or will not acknowledge), that in the contemplation of its compilers the terms 'regenerated' and 'baptized' were *convertible or equivalent.* We read in the English Article, as it now stands, 'This infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are *regenerated*. . . . . And although there is no condemnation for them that *believe and are baptized,*' &c. (Even here, Baptism is implied to be necessary to regeneration). But in the English Article of 1562, the word in the former clause, as well as in the latter, was 'baptized,' not 'regenerated;' it was the same in the English Article of 1552. Yet, in all these six instances, the word in the Latin is uniformly 'renatis,' which is, as we have seen, in the English rendered literally '*regenerated*' but once, and *baptized* five times. Is it possible to resist the manifest inference, that the compilers of the Articles regarded 'baptized' and 'regenerated' as *both implying the same thing?*" (Charge, 3rd ed. pp. 16, 17,)

Now I will not stop to comment on the phraseology of this passage. The public are by this time so accustomed to the mode in which the Bishop of Exeter is in the habit of announcing his views, that his charges of "wilful blindness," &c., have not, I suspect, much weight. How far they are just on the present occasion, a very few words will demonstrate. The fact is, that the change of the word "baptized" to "regenerated" in the former part of the Article, affords a strong argument *against* the Bishop's view, and the conclusion drawn from the latter part as to the "convertibility or equivalence" of the words "baptized" and "regenerated," proves too much, and therefore falls to the ground, as I shall now proceed to show.

The object of the former part (here referred to) of the Article, is to show that the infection of nature remains even in those that have received the full grace of baptism, full spiritual regeneration. Now, in the English translations of the Latin Articles, published previously to our present authorized translation (which was received and sanctioned by the Convocation of 1571, and legalized by an Act of Parliament of the same year), none of which had any authority, the very names of the translators being, I believe,

unknown, the words "Manet etiam in renatis hæc naturæ depravatio," were translated, "and this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are *baptized*." But when the Convocation of 1571 had to present to Parliament a translation of the Articles authorized by the Church, the word "baptized" here was *changed* to "regenerated." Now, it is obvious, that if in respect to the full sense of the word "regenerated," the words "baptized" and "regenerated" are "convertible or equivalent," such a *change* would have been wholly unnecessary. But here we see, that when the full sense of the word "renatis" is wanted, the word "baptized" is not considered sufficient to express it, but it is struck out, and the word "regenerated" put in its place. This change therefore affords us remarkably strong evidence that the Bishops of that day did not hold his Lordship's views.

The conclusion which the Bishop derives from the latter part of the Article proves too much, and therefore at once falls to the ground. He says, the words "renatis et credentibus" are translated "them that believe and are baptized," and *therefore* "baptized" and "regenerated" are "convertible or equivalent" terms, and "both imply the same thing." This (if we use the word "regenerated" as implying *spiritual regeneration*, which is the subject of the controversy) is obviously inadmissible. Nay, the Bishop himself does not hold it, for he is compelled to admit, that in the case of adult baptism, the assertion of the adult being then regenerated, is only the language of "Christian charity." (Charge, 3rd ed. p. 41.) And if he did not admit it, he would be immediately convicted of holding doctrine opposed to the 25th Article, which declares that "in such *only* as *worthily* receive the Sacraments, they have a wholesome effect or operation." There is an end at once, therefore, to the assertion, that the words "regenerated" (in the sense of *spiritual regeneration*) and "baptized" are "convertible or equivalent." In fact it is perfectly astounding that any Bishop of our Church should have ventured to put his name to such a proposition; the statement of Hooker, that "all receive not the grace of God that receive the Sacraments of his grace," being so notoriously the doctrine of our Church.

There is, no doubt, a sense in which all that are *baptized* may be called *regenerated*, i. e. on account of their having received *the*

Sacrament of regeneration, (which is *necessarily* the meaning of the Article) and this is a sense common enough in the writings of our divines; just as they would speak of a man who had partaken of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as one who had partaken of the Body and Blood of Christ, although "the wicked," as our 29th Article tells us, "in no wise are partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink *the sign or sacrament* of so great a thing."

The next passage to be noticed occurs in the 15th Article, which, singularly enough, is quoted by the Bishop in favour of his view, although, as far as its testimony goes, it is clearly opposed to it. But the Bishop has actually *altered the punctuation of the Article* so as to make it speak his doctrine. The misquotation is rather remarkable, but I cannot suppose it to be more than a culpable instance of haste and carelessness. The Bishop gives the passage thus. I quote it with his own italics and punctuation.

"Thus the 15th, after speaking of 'Christ alone without sin,' says 'All we the rest (although *baptized and born again in Christ*) yet offend in many things.'" (p. 15.)

Now even taking it thus, it does not follow that the expressions "baptized" and "born again in Christ" are equivalent, although, there being no comma after "baptized," the reader might be in *doubt* whether the two expressions did not refer to the same act. But if a comma be placed after the word "baptized," the doubt is at once cleared up, and the two expressions stand *separate* and *independent*. Now what is the fact? *I can find no edition of the Latin Articles, nor any of the English of our present authorized translation, in which a comma is not placed after "baptized."** In fact it is quite clear, that wherever the Sacrament of Baptism is spoken of *in general terms,* applying to adult as well as infant baptism, the words "baptized" and "regenerated" (in the sense of *spiritual regeneration*) cannot,—by those at least who believe that in adults the Sacrament has a "wholesome effect or operation" in "those *only* who *worthily* receive" it,—be used as equivalent.

There remains one more Article to be noticed, the 16th, in

* The words in the Latin are, "Sed nos reliqui etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes."

which the Bishop's interpretation labours under the same objection as in those we have just been noticing, namely, that it makes a general statement respecting baptism apply to every case in which baptism is administered, and thus, as before, is opposed to the 25th Article and the Bishop's own doctrine. "Not every deadly sin," says the 16th Article, "committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost and unpardonable." Upon which the Bishop remarks,—

"How could such an imagination have entered into the mind of any one, unless it were a known and acknowledged truth, that the Holy Ghost is the special and appropriate gift in Baptism?" (p. 16.)

Be it so; but what then? It does not follow that this "special and appropriate gift" is always bestowed upon every recipient of baptism; and the 25th Article *maintains that it is not*. These words therefore do not help his Lordship in the smallest degree. The Bishop adds, "The very phrase '*deadly* sin' implies that there was 'Life, *spiritual* Life,' in the soul before the sin was committed." This can only be considered a *lapsus* of the pen, as it is obvious that the epithet "deadly," which is merely descriptive of the *character* of the sin, cannot prove that all that commit such a sin had spiritual life in them before the commission of it. A sin may be a deadly sin, though committed by one in a state of spiritual death.

But, further, any impartial person reading the Article itself, will see at once that the sentence to which the Bishop here refers is merely intended as a denial of the doctrine of those who maintained that sin after baptism was sin against the Holy Ghost and unpardonable. It runs thus,—

"Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism."

Now it signifies not what "entered into the mind" (to use the Bishop's phrase) of those who maintained such an error. They may perhaps have supposed that the Holy Ghost was always given in baptism. But with that our Reformers had nothing to do. They found the error maintained, and they contradicted it. But to assume from that, that they held the view which the Bishop considers as a necessary foundation upon which to ground the error they refuted, is of course altogether unwarrantable.

And the very next words are inconsistent with the supposition that they did so. For it follows, as a distinct sentence,—"After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin," &c., which, according to the Bishop of Exeter's interpretation (loc. c.) means, "After we have been baptized, we may fall into sin." But the Article has just before been speaking of the commission of sin after baptism, and saying that it was not unpardonable, of course making its possible existence a matter of no doubt. It would have been absurd therefore to add here a formal announcement that it may exist after baptism. We here again therefore see, in the very words which the Bishop would fain press into his service, an argument against his view. For the Article, after having taken for granted the possibility of sin after baptism, adds, *as something distinct*, the possibility of sin being committed after the Holy Ghost has been received.

We do not find, then, one shred of evidence in any one of the Articles in support of the notion that spiritual regeneration is conferred upon all infants in baptism. And on the contrary, we *do* find a *general doctrine* laid down in the Articles on the subject of baptism altogether opposed to such a view.

And before I close this review of the sense of the Articles on the subject, I would remind the reader, how utterly inconsistent they would be, if there was in them any statement of such a doctrine. For not only would the Articles I have already quoted be opposed to one another on such a hypothesis, but the acknowledged purpose of the 17th Article, to admit those holding what are called "Calvinistic" views, would be entirely defeated. In speaking thus of the 17th Article, I am taking much lower ground than I might fairly take, but it is sufficient for my argument to take the matter as it is *admitted to be* by all reasonable men on both sides, and consider the Article as drawn up so as to *allow* of the maintenance of "Calvinistic" views. Bishop Burnet, in his Comment on the Article, freely admits, though holding himself Arminian views, that "the Calvinists have less occasion for scruple [*i. e.* in subscribing the Article], since *the Article does seem more plainly to favour them.*"* Such being

* Expos. of XXXIX Articles. On Art. 17. 5th ed. Lond. 1746. p. 221.

the case, then, it is absurd to suppose that in the very same Articles a doctrine would be inserted directly opposed to such views. It is a fundamental tenet in the "Calvinistic" system, that none are ever spiritually regenerated, and made truly the children of God by spiritual adoption, and grafted into Christ's Body as true members, but those who will ultimately be saved. But the doctrine of the universal spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism is entirely opposed to this view. And consequently its introduction into the Articles would have been fatal to the comprehensive policy upon which they are supposed to have been drawn up. And I think impartial readers of the third Chapter of this work will agree with me in thinking, that before we can adopt the "High Church" view of the Articles, we must suppose that our Reformers and early divines voluntarily drew up Articles speaking doctrine contrary to their own.

The Bishop of Exeter has quoted,* in defence of his views, a passage from Dr. Jackson. I am quite ready to admit the claims of Dr. Jackson to a respectful hearing; though I do not think an *obiter dictum* such as the Bishop has quoted from him is quite the sort of testimony to rest much upon. The Bishop truly cites him as saying,—"That infants are by baptism regenerated, we may not deny, unless we will take upon us to put another sense upon the Articles than they will naturally bear."†

Now if the sense which the Bishop has extracted from this passage were the correct one, still what he has to prove is, not merely that some individuals took this view, but that it was sanctioned by such a weight of authority as to make it the only view fairly admissible in our Church.

But the earliest Commentary upon our Articles, that by Rogers, and one that was enjoined for use upon all the clergy of his province by Archbishop Bancroft, takes (as we have seen) a different view; and this work (to mention no more) is clearly a better authority than Dr. Jackson's opinion, especially in the cursory way in which it is given.

The fact, however, is, that Dr. Jackson's view, as a whole, is very different from that of the Bishop, for he holds that infantine

---

* Charge, p. 20.

† On the Creed, Bk. xi. c. 17. Works, iii. 471. How is it that the Bishop gives no reference to the place where this passage occurs?

regeneration is such as does not last beyond the age of infancy. He says,—

"The same measure of regeneration which sufficeth children or infants dying before they come to the use of reason, will not suffice such as attain to the use of reason or years of discretion. . . . . He that affirms them to be *truly regenerated or sanctified* in their infancy must yield to us in this; That such children or infants as have been formerly regenerated in a measure sufficient to their salvation outgrow this measure of regeneration or sanctification after they come to the use of reason or years of discretion, as they do their apparel or clothes which were fit for them whilst they were infants."*

What he means by regeneration, then, in infants, is very different from what the Bishop means by it. For he here distinguishes himself from those who "affirm them to be *truly regenerated or sanctified.*" His view, in fact, is much the same as that of Bishop Davenant. And I will add two more passages from him, further explaining his doctrine on regeneration. He says,—

"But here some have questioned whether this chapter [Rom. vii.] be meant of the regenerate or unregenerate man. A captious interrogatory; [as] if regeneration were but one act, or a resultance of some few acts or conflicts between the flesh and the Spirit. But seeing regeneration in true theology includes acts almost numberless, or a combat somewhat longer than mortification doth: this chapter, if we speak of Christians, must be meant not of the man truly regenerated or perfectly mortified, but of a man *inter regenerandum*, during the intermediate acts or conflicts betwixt the beginning and consummation of his regeneration. (See the 9th Art. of the Church of England.)"†

"The utmost of my endeavours is to direct myself, and the height of my desires in this work is, to advise others what we are to do for ourselves, or what is to be done for us, after Baptism or Confirmation, that we may be *throughly regenerated*, or which is in effect all one, make our election sure."‡

Our modern "High Church" divines will gain but little real help from Dr. Jackson, as they will clearly see, if they will peruse his Treatise on the Church in the latter part of his Ex-

---

* Jackson on the Creed, Bk. x. c. 27. iii. 100.
† Ib. bk. x. c. 10. iii. 26. ‡ Ib. bk. x. c. 13. iii. 37.

position on the Creed. He has no sympathy with those who call all adults regenerate that have been baptized in infancy; and here lies the great and all important point of distinction between the two prevailing systems of doctrine on the subject.

The true interpretation, then, of the Articles on the question of the effects of Baptism is, I submit, what has been given above. And I would add, that as the Exposition of Thomas Rogers (already frequently quoted) is the best and most authentic Commentary upon them, in giving us the views of our Church at the very period of their last revision in 1571, (for the first edition of his work was published only fourteen years after, and received on its second impression Archbishop Bancroft's express sanction,) so the Commentary of Bishop Burnet (which I shall quote hereafter) is a fair proof of the views of at least a large body of our divines at a later period, when the current theology of our Church had become of a somewhat different character. And it will be found, that as the first interprets the Articles entirely upon the "Calvinistic" view of doctrine, so the latter, while giving the preference to the "Arminian" system, yet clearly opposes the notion that spiritual regeneration is given to all infants at their baptism.

§ 2. *The doctrine of the Book of Homilies.*

I have next to review the testimony of the Book of Homilies on the effects of Infant Baptism. Here, as in the case of the Articles, certain passages have been selected by the Bishop of Exeter, and, with a hasty zeal for the maintenance of his favourite theory on the subject of Infant Baptism, put forward by him as supporting a doctrine inconsistent with his own view on the subject of Adult Baptism.

Remarking that the 11th Article refers to the Homily on Salvation in words which "amount to adopting the doctrine of that Homily on the particular specially set forth" in the Article (in which remark I cordially concur with his Lordship), he tells us, that we have here "another proof of the *inherent and essential* grace of Christian baptism."* The INHERENT and ESSENTIAL

* Charge, 3d ed. p. 18.

grace of baptism! What a specimen of the theology of a Bishop of a Protestant Church! Here is a doctrine which even the later scholastic divines would have repudiated. For their doctrine, notoriously, was, that the grace of God is not tied to the Sacraments. But if grace is "INHERENT and ESSENTIAL" to baptism, it is so tied to it that it is impossible for one to be separated from the other. It is difficult to account for such language. And as my object is to meet arguments that have a show of plausibility, I omit any further notice of such a statement as this.

The proof derived from the Homily, for this doctrine, is thus stated:—

"You will see," says the Bishop, "in the Homily, that 'the true understanding of this doctrine [*i. e.* of justification by faith] includes the acknowledgment of the remission of original sin in Baptism.' You will also see that the word 'baptized' is used as equivalent to 'justified,' and to being 'made Christ's members.'"

And the passages quoted in proof of this are the following.

"Justification is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render unto him, but which we receive of him; not which we give to him, but which we take of him, by his free mercy, and by the only merits of his most dearly beloved Son, our only Redeemer, Saviour, and Justifier, Jesus Christ. So that the true understanding of this doctrine, We be justified freely by faith without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ which is within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves); but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word and believe it, although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread and fear of God within us, and do never so many good works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues, of faith, hope, charity, and all our other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak, and insufficient, and imperfect, to deserve remission of our sins, and our justification: and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus the Son of God once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us

after our baptism, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to him again." (Second Part of Homily of Salvation.)*

"You have heard the office of God in our justification, and how we receive it of him freely by his mercy, without our deserts, through true and lively faith. Now you shall hear the office and duty of a Christian man unto God—what we ought, on our part, to render unto God again for his grace, mercy, and goodness. Our office is, not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly after that we are baptized or justified, not caring how few good works we do to the glory of God and profit of our neighbours. Much less is it our office, after that we be once made Christ's members, to live contrary to the same." (Third Part of same Homily.)†

Now, in the first place, it is not a little remarkable, that if such is the true meaning of this Homily, namely that we are justified by baptism, Bishop Gardiner should have so strongly *objected* to it on the very ground that we are all justified as infants in the Sacrament of Baptism.‡ And if we want to know what Cranmer (who was the author of the Homily) meant by our being by baptism "made Christ's members," we may satisfy ourselves on this point by a reference to the quotations given above§ from the "Institution for a Christian Man," which, though written ten years before, (in 1537,) contains, in this matter, a very explicit refutation of the Bishop of Exeter's views. We shall there see, that he draws a very clear and decided distinction between those who are nominally and outwardly Christ's members, by being in outward communion with his Church, and those who are so verily and in truth. Further, whatever may be the view intended to be inculcated by the remark as to the remission of original sin in baptism, whether it means that the guilt of original sin is always remitted to infants in their baptism, or whether it speaks only (as is frequently the case in such passages written at that period) with reference to the case of the true members of Christ, still this is entirely different from the

* The Bishop adds to this extract,—"Jewell, in like manner, says (Defence of Apol. p. 66), 'We be justified before God only *by faith*; that is to say, *only by the merits and cross of Christ*.'" The relevancy of this quotation to the Baptismal question, I am unable to see. Its apparent object is, to make use of these words of Jewell for the eversion of the great Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. *Valeat quantum.*

† I quote from the Christian Knowledge Society's edition of the Homilies, 1833.

‡ See p. 187 above.

§ See pp. 197—200 above.

gift of spiritual regeneration. Many who hold that original sin is always remitted to the infants of Christians in baptism, wholly deny that they are universally made by that rite partakers of spiritual regeneration; as for instance Bishop Carleton, as above quoted.

Lastly, to interpret the words "baptized or justified" as showing that the word "baptized" is considered as *equivalent to* "justified," is not merely to assume a particular meaning for the word "or," when it is at least quite as open to another sense, but to give an interpretation to the words entirely opposed both to Cranmer's known sentiments and the doctrine of the other part of the Homily. The argument which Cranmer adduced to Gardiner in defence of the doctrine of this very Homily, as quoted above,* shows that such a meaning is entirely opposed to the view he intended to inculcate.

Unless also it be assumed (which we have no right to assume) that the passage refers only to infant baptism, the Bishop of Exeter himself will not stand to his own interpretation of the passage, for he does not believe that baptism is equivalent to justification in the case of adults. And if it refers only to infants, then the word "justified," even if used as the Bishop contends it is used, must be taken in some limited sense which makes it refer only to the infantine state (signifying perhaps the remission of original sin), and therefore does not touch the question of the gift of spiritual regeneration; for the direct and express object which the Homily has in view is to inculcate the doctrine that all capable of faith are justified by faith only. Nothing that took place in baptism is referred to as having any efficacy for the justification of an adult.

Further, there is another passage in this Homily where the baptism of infants is spoken of, in which the phraseology made use of is worthy of especial notice. After speaking of the Sacrifice made by Christ for our sins, it adds,—

"Insomuch that infants, being baptized *and dying in their infancy*, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made his children, and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven."†

Now according to the views of those who hold, that *all* infants receive spiritual regeneration in baptism, and are made thereby

* See pp. 186, 187, above. † Homily of Salvation, Part I. *init.*

true members of Christ and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, the words "*and dying in their infancy*" are superfluous and delusive. It is impossible not to see, that in this passage there is a careful limitation of any positive and definite statement as to the benefit of baptism in particular infants, to the case of infants "dying in their infancy;" where I readily allow that there is ground to maintain their universal acceptance. And still further, be it observed, the blessing of ablution from sin and being made God's children is attributed, not to baptism, but to Christ's sacrifice, applied to those that are "baptized *and die in their infancy;*" but not necessarily even to them in or by baptism.

Another passage is quoted by his Lordship* from the Homily "of Common Prayer and Sacraments," which runs thus :—

"As for the number of them [i. e. the Sacraments], if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for the visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of sins and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord."

But how this passage can prove the universal efficacy of baptism in the case of infants, I am quite unable to see. For not only do the expressions used refer to Baptism in the abstract, and therefore as much to the case of adults as to that of infants, (in the former of which it is admitted that the gift of grace does not always accompany the ministration of the outward rite) but to *both* the Sacraments; and none suppose that the grace of the Sacrament, in the case of the Lord's Supper, is given to any but a worthy recipient.

And the same answer applies to other passages that are sometimes quoted from the Homilies on this subject; and in fact to a vast number of passages that are often heaped up from various quarters on this subject, which speak only of the great value and blessed effects of Baptism *in the abstract*. All these phrases apply as much to the baptism of adults as to that of infants. They no more prove therefore that Baptism is universally efficacious in the latter case, than that it is so in the former.

I am not aware of any passage in the Book of Homilies that

---

* Charge, 3rd ed. p. 20.

has been quoted on this subject, (besides those above noticed), to which this general remark does not supply a complete answer.

And though there are no passages directly defining the doctrine of our Church on the subject of our present inquiry (which indeed we could hardly expect in a volume of practical sermons), we shall find several containing statements inconsistent with the view that the mere act of baptism confers spiritual regeneration upon all infants. Thus in the Homily "Of Swearing" it is said;—

"*By holy promises,* with calling the name of God to witness, we be made lively members of Christ, when we profess his religion, receiving the Sacrament of Baptism."

The doctrine also of the following passage cannot easily be mistaken. Speaking in the second part of the Homily "of Alms-deeds," of the meaning of such phrases as that alms wash away our sins, it is said,—

"They mean this, and this is the understanding of those and such like sayings, that God of his mercy and especial favour towards them whom he hath *appointed to everlasting salvation,* hath so *offered his grace especially,* and they have so received it fruitfully, that although, by reason of their sinful living outwardly, they seemed before to have been the children of wrath and perdition; yet now the Spirit of God mightily working in them, unto obedience to God's will and commandments, they declare by their outward deeds and life, in the shewing of mercy and charity, (which cannot come *but of the Spirit of God, and his special grace,*) that they are *the undoubted children of God appointed to everlasting life.* And so, as by their wickedness and ungodly living they shewed themselves according to the judgment of men, which follow the outward appearance, to be reprobates and cast-aways; so now, by their obedience unto God's holy will, and by their mercifulness and tender pity (wherein they shew themselves to be like unto God, who is the fountain and spring of all mercy,) they declare openly and manifestly unto the sight of men, that they are *the sons of God,* and the *elect of him unto salvation.*"

Moreover, in the first part of the Homily for Whitsunday, we have passages directly bearing upon the subject. This Homily expressly treats on Regeneration, and throughout all that is to be found in it on this point, *not the slightest reference is made to baptism.*

Its language is as follows:—

"As for the works of the Spirit, the fruits of faith, charitable and godly motions, if he have any at all in him, they proceed only of the Holy Ghost, who is the only worker of our sanctification, and maketh us new men in Christ Jesus. . . . And who can choose but marvel to consider, that Peter should become of a simple fisher, a chief and mighty Apostle? Paul of a cruel and bloody persecutor, a faithful disciple of Christ, to teach the Gentiles? *Such is the power of the Holy Ghost to regenerate men*, and as it were to bring them forth anew, *so that they shall be nothing like the men that they were before.* Neither doth he think it sufficient inwardly to work the spiritual and new birth of man, unless he do also dwell and abide in him. . . . . But *how shall I know that the Holy Ghost is within me?* some man perchance will say. Forsooth, *as the tree is known by its fruit, so is also the Holy Ghost.* . . Here is now that glass, wherein thou must behold thyself, and discern whether thou have the Holy Ghost within thee or the spirit of the flesh. If thou see that thy works be virtuous and good, consonant to the prescript rule of God's word, savouring and tasting not of the flesh, but of the Spirit, then assure thyself that thou art endued with the Holy Ghost: otherwise, in thinking well of thyself, thou dost nothing else but deceive thyself."

Such is the language in which this Homily speaks of regeneration. Whether it is consistent with the notion that all receive this regeneration who are baptized in infancy, may safely be left to the judgment of the impartial reader.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

§ 1. *Examination of the Baptismal Services for Infants, and proof of the principle on which they are constructed, by a comparison of them with the other Services in the Book of Common Prayer.*

THE stronghold of those who maintain that our Church teaches that *all* infants are spiritually regenerated in baptism, is in certain expressions found in the Services for the administration of that rite. That the popular mind should be misled, in the present day, by the phraseology there used, is not perhaps matter for much surprise; but that it should be deliberately asserted, by those who profess an acquaintance with the early history of our Reformed Church, that such was the meaning intended to be affixed to these expressions by our Reformers and early divines, is what may well excite our wonder. The evidence given above of the doctrine of our Church in their day, as shown by the writings of her chief guides and brightest ornaments, must have gone far, I should conceive, to settle the point already in the mind of the reader; or at least to show him, that there must have been some extraordinary and unaccountable inconsistency between their own doctrine and that which they inculcated in the Formularies they drew up for the Church, if they meant those Formularies to bear the sense which has been attributed to them. But the majority of our modern divines, attached to a very different school of theology from that of our Reformation, contemplate our Services from a totally different point of view, and in connexion with a different system of theology from that of those who first drew them up and used them; and, slight-

ing the writings of the very men to whom we are indebted for them, and consequently ignorant of the meaning of the phraseology of that period, naturally misconstrue them.

An impartial review, however, of the Prayer Book itself, *as a whole*, is, alone, sufficient to dispel the delusion; the whole Book, in all its Services, being drawn up precisely upon the same principle, namely, that of *supposing* that all interested in its Services are the *true* and *living* members of Christ's Body, the Church. Explained upon this principle, all the Services in the Book are intelligible, and consistent with each other, *and upon no other principle are they so*. If this method of interpretation is departed from, all is confusion and inconsistency. And they who are clamouring the loudest for the application of a contrary principle of interpretation in the case of the Baptismal Services for Infants, are themselves compelled to admit that other Services *must* be so understood.

In proceeding, then, to examine the Baptismal Services for Infants, I commence with the remark that I give the highest sense to the blessing spoken of both in the prayers and thanksgivings offered. I do not believe that the blessing there meant is only an introduction into the visible Church, or anything less than spiritual regeneration; that is, *a grafting into the Body of Christ of his true members by that rite which he has himself appointed as the external and visible mode of perfecting that union*. But the whole Service proceeds upon the *hypothesis*, that the party baptized is, in the eye of God, (which takes in all time and events *as present*) one of his accepted ones. In all such cases baptism (whether its sensible effects be *immediate* or *in abeyance* and *future*,) is efficacious.

First, let us consider the Form for Public Baptism.

The proof that this *hypothetical* system of interpretation is that intended to be affixed to the Service, must of course be *mainly* derived from a comparison of it with other parts of the Prayer Book, and the known sentiments of those who drew up the Form, or *originally* sanctioned and approved of it, and such like considerations. But *the Service itself* supplies us with some evidence on the subject, and particularly in one passage, HALF *of which* is often quoted by those who take a contrary view, as favoring their mode of interpretation. It is said that, in the Exhortation, those who bring the child are thus addressed,—"Doubt ye not, there-

fore, but earnestly believe, that he will likewise favourably receive this present infant,"—and therefore that the acceptance of the infant ought to be a matter of faith, and no doubt entertained about it. This is urged by the Bishop of Exeter.* Now it is only necessary to go to the end of the sentence, to see that this passage is in fact strongly confirmatory of the view that the *hypothetical* principle of interpretation is the correct one. For the whole sentence is this,—"Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that he will likewise favorably receive this present infant; that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy; that HE WILL GIVE UNTO HIM THE BLESSING OF ETERNAL LIFE, AND MAKE HIM PARTAKER OF HIS EVERLASTING KINGDOM." So that with precisely the same sort of assurance that we are exhorted to believe that God will then favorably receive the infant, are we exhorted to believe that he will ultimately save him and admit him into heaven. No words could show more clearly what is the nature of the confidence required; namely, that it is that of charitable hope and presumption.

Further; as we proceed in the Service, it is required that certain stipulations and promises be made *in the name of the child*, to be performed as soon as he is of age to perform them. And these promises are reckoned as the promises of the child, and made a most important part of the Service, as we see in the words,—"After this promise made by Christ, this infant must also faithfully, for his part, promise by you that are his sureties, (until he come of age to take it upon himself) that he will renounce," &c. And our Catechism expressly tells us, that baptism is given to infants, "BECAUSE *they* promise faith and repentance by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." To infants, then, who reach adult age, the Church (if she were able to foresee whether or not this would be the case) *would not give baptism* if she knew that this promise never would be fulfilled. For otherwise the stipulation is a nullity and an absurdity. It is replied, that the Church allows baptism to be administered to infants not likely to live, without any such stipulations, and considers the baptism valid. Doubtless she does; nor would she reiterate baptism in the case of any child baptized without sponsors.

* Charge, p. 40.

Such sponsions are not necessary to make the rite valid, but their requisition shows the sense our Church entertains of the *nature* of the rite. And this is what we want to know. And in the case of sick children, she ministers the rite, without sponsions, *as to those who are about to die in their infancy*, and never to be capable of faith and repentance; whom she believes to be saved as being in the same covenant with their parents, assuming them (as she is bound to do,) to be the children of true believers. But immediately the condition of the infant is changed, she requires these stipulations to be entered into for him before he is formally recognized as a member of the Church. It is impossible for her, *in the nature of things*, to do more to show her sense of the necessity of certain engagements being entered into in behalf of any child about to reach adult age, before it is recognized even outwardly as a member of Christ. It must ever be recollected, that Baptism is a rite in which a covenant-engagement is entered into between God and man; in which, therefore, the engagement on God's part is to be met by a corresponding engagement on the part of man; and where the baptized party is too young to make this promise in his own person, it is made by others for him; and baptism is administered on this vicarious pledge, in order that God's children (whom we cannot discern from the rest at that age) may not lack the seal of the covenant, and that rite which has been appointed by God for the formal and visible incorporation of men into his family as his adopted children.

Thus then an engagement is entered into on behalf of the child, and baptism given on that condition. Now if this engagement is never fulfilled by the child, (which is foreseen by God from the first,) what right have we to say that he is ever made a partaker of the full baptismal blessing? Either this engagement is a perfect nullity and mockery, or it indicates a belief on the part of the Church that the baptismal blessing is only to be expected, *in the case of infants that reach adult age*, when what is then promised is performed. In such cases, and in such only, can she consider baptism to be efficacious.

But such an engagement having been entered into, and our duty being (as she conceives) "*not to doubt*" that the infant is one of those whom God will accept and ultimately save, a thanksgiving is offered after the child has been baptized, for the

bestowal of the full baptismal blessing. And this thanksgiving is of course offered in the same sense in which we are exhorted not to doubt that the child will be saved. It may be that our earnest and undoubting hope that the child is one whom God will accept, and who will fulfil the promises made for him, is not well-founded, and the applicability of the thanksgiving of course depends upon this. But it being *presumed* that such is the case, the Church offers a thanksgiving for the bestowal of the blessing which *in such cases* is connected with the rite.

And to illustrate the case where the Baptismal blessing is not immediate but expectative, let us consider an example of a similar kind (so far as human things can be compared with Divine) among men. A wealthy individual promises to make over an estate to an infant to be possessed by him when he comes to years of discretion, on condition of a very small payment being made by him at that period, and agrees to sign and seal the deeds on condition of a promise being made for the child by certain sureties that he will pay what is required at the proposed time. All the parties come together publicly to ratify this covenant. In what terms will the sponsors for the child address the generous friend who has made the transfer, when the deeds are completed? Will they turn their back upon him, and say, we will offer you no thanks for your kindness, for we know not whether the child may not, after all, refuse to give the mite required to put him in possession of the estate, and so derive no benefit from the covenant? Or will they emphatically thank him for his bounty, as *a gift already bestowed?* There can be but one answer to such a question. Thanks would be returned in similar language to what would be employed if the party to whom the gift was made was of age, and had already made the payment required.

Now this case, so far as concerns the question of thanksgiving for a gift which is yet conditional, and may never be realized, is very similar to that before us. There are of course points in which the two cases are dissimilar, but the question of the propriety of a thanksgiving in a case where the enjoyment of the gift is only conditional and presumed, is, I think, forcibly illustrated by the example mentioned. I do not here touch the question whether true faith and repentance are, or are not, only given to certain individuals

chosen by God as heirs of salvation. That is a distinct subject of inquiry.

Our Reformers and early divines clearly used the thanksgiving in the Baptismal Service, under the notion, that we are to presume, that the infant baptized is one of the elect, and so is interested in the Divine favour, and will fulfil the terms of the covenant. But that is not the only sense in which the thanksgiving may be used. It is the appropriate language of *all* who believe that a covenant has then been made by God with the child, in which the blessing of being received as a son of God, that is, spiritually regenerated, is made over to the child, to be enjoyed by him whenever his moral state corresponds with the conditions of the covenant.

Our Church clearly requires in adults faith and repentance as the necessary qualifications for being made in baptism sons of God, and in infants that stipulation of future faith and repentance which shows that in their case she makes her expectation of the gift of full spiritual regeneration to rest upon the supposition of these acts being ultimately produced. And in both cases the thanksgiving for the bestowal of regeneration and adoption is properly offered *when the covenant is signed and sealed in Baptism*. Just as in the case above mentioned, whether the party to whom the gift of the estate is made be an adult, who renders at once what is required, or whether he be an infant for whom others undertake that it shall be paid by him, the thanksgiving is offered to the donor when the deed of transfer is signed and sealed.

The key to the right understanding of this subject lies in the contemplation of Baptism as the act in and by which the Gospel covenant between God and man is signed and sealed. And when we view it in this light, we see at once the justice of Bishop Davenant's remark,* that "it is not necessary to suppose that the Sacraments effect, at the moment of their administration, all they represent, the schoolmen themselves allowing, that a covenant admitting of delay in its fulfilment has place, when, in the very act of making it, there is an impediment to the fulfilment of its conditions."

In the above remarks I have of course been more especially con-

* See p. 302, 303, above.

templating the case where the Baptismal blessing is future. There may however be, if it please God, an immediate effect from the rite of baptism in the case of infants. The seeds of faith and repentance may be implanted in the heart by God at the earliest age, and adoption into God's family take place in the fullest sense at baptism. Or if we take the Calvinistic view, such adoption may take place at baptism in the case of all *the elect*. But still even in these cases it must be observed, that, as respects those who live to adult age, such adoption takes place in the prospective contemplation of the acts of faith and repentance following in their due season. So that in all cases the bestowal of the blessing has in view the fulfilment of the promises made. *But the moral condition of the party baptized, whether adult or infant, is not always made in or by Baptism such as to put him in possession of the blessings of the covenant.*

And it is observable, that in this Service, as originally drawn up, and as it remained up to 1662, there were some very expressive words, strongly indicative of the views of the original compilers; and though the Laudian divines of 1662 threw them out, they could not by that means get rid of the argument with which they supply us as to the interpretation originally put upon the other part of the Service. In the first Liturgy of 1549, there were *two* prayers having reference to the water used for baptizing.* The first commenced thus,—"O most merciful God our Saviour Jesu Christ, who hast ordained the element of water for the regeneration of THY FAITHFUL PEOPLE . . . . sanctify this fountain of baptism," &c. This prayer of consecration was left out in the Liturgy of 1552, apparently at the instance of Bucer, who objected to such a *consecration of the water*.† But the views of those who drew up the Service as to the character of the parties benefited by the Sacrament, even in the case of infants (which is what we want to ascertain), are remarkably illustrated by it.

The other prayer, (which remained in the Service unaltered till 1662,) was this,—

"Almighty, everliving God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus

* They are placed in this Liturgy at the end of the Office for Private Baptism.

† See his "Censura," in his Scripta Anglicana, pp. 481, 482.

Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood, and gave commandment to his disciples that they should go teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation, and grant that all THY SERVANTS which shall be baptized in this water, prepared for the ministration of thy holy Sacrament, may receive the fulness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

In the Review in 1662, the words, "And grant, &c.," are changed to, "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin, and grant that *this child* now to be baptized therein may receive, &c." Here (besides the restoration of the consecration of the water, which is immaterial to our present subject) an alteration is made in the language of the prayer, the reason of which is obvious. But the alteration cannot effect any change in the sense in which the Service is to be understood. It is a very apt specimen of the way in which the Laudian divines of 1662, not daring openly to re-model the Formularies after their own views, contrived to slip in a few words in one place, and leave out a few in another, and alter a few in a third, so as to take off the edge of expressions that might tell against them, and introduce what might serve as an unsuspected foundation on which to build their doctrines.* But, providentially, their power was not equal to their will for mischievous changes of this kind, and therefore our Formularies speak precisely the same doctrine they did before. I shall show presently that no openly Laudian changes were likely to have passed the House of Commons.

But what is most pressed, perhaps, in this Service, by those who take a contrary view to that here maintained, is the following rubric at the end of it.

"It is certain by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved."

This rubric was inserted at the Review in 1662,† at the end of the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants, instead of one which occurred in the previous Books at the commencement of the Order for Confirmation in the following words:—

* This has been fully admitted by recent writers of similar views. But this is not the place to enlarge upon this point.

† I use the date 1662, because the Review was not *completed* till that period.

"And that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their Confirmation, he shall know for truth, that it is certain by God's word, that children being baptized, have all things necessary for their salvation, and be undoubtedly saved."

This rubric was open to exception, because it might seem to intimate, that even after the children were old enough to commit sin, they might be saved by their baptism. The saving clause in our present rubric,—"dying before they commit actual sin,"—removes, to my mind, all reasonable ground of objection to it. It must be remembered, that our Church administers baptism to infants, as those who, in their infantine state, are included in the same covenant with their parents, who are supposed to be true believers. This has been already so clearly proved in the extracts given above from Nowell's Catechism * and our early divines, that I think it unnecessary to quote further evidence. Now few, if any, have denied salvation to such infants dying in their infancy. And, to serve for all, I beg the reader's attention to the following passage from the Decrees of the famous Calvinistic Synod of Dort.

"Since we must judge of the will of God from his word, which testifies that the children of the faithful are holy, not indeed by nature, but by the benefit of a gratuitous covenant in which they are comprehended with their parents, pious parents OUGHT NOT TO DOUBT of the election and salvation of their children whom God calls out of this life in infancy."†

It may perhaps be replied, But our Church says, that such infants being "*baptized*" are saved. I answer, No doubt she does, because it is not for her to *dispense* with God's sacraments, and *pronounce a definite decision* on those who die without them, whatever *hope* she may entertain on the subject. But it is admitted that she does not consider the Sacrament of Baptism in such a case necessary to salvation, and therefore does not tie God's saving grace to it.‡ While at the same time, in the case of all the children of true believers, dying in their infancy, baptism would

---

See pp. 257, 258, above.

† Quandoquidem de voluntate Dei ex verbo ipsius nobis est judicandum, quod testatur liberos fidelium esse sanctos, non quidem natura, sed beneficio fœderis gratuiti, in quo illi cum parentibus comprehenduntur, pii parentes de electione et salute suorum liberorum, quos Deus in infantia ex hac vita evocat, *dubitare non debent*. c. 1. art. 17. Acta Syn. Dordrecht. Dordr. 1620. 4to. p. 282.

‡ See Laurence's Bampton Lect. pp. 69—72; and p. 206 above.

be freely admitted by all to be ultimately salutary. But still, grace is given, even in this case, not necessarily in or by Baptism, but when God pleases.

Thus Peter Martyr, in his Lectures at Oxford, says of infants dying unbaptized, "I *hope well* of the state of such infants, inasmuch as I see them to be born of faithful parents:"—but of those that die baptized he says, "It is to be *firmly believed* that children dying who have been baptized are saved."*

And it must be observed, that since our Church administers baptism to infants as the children of true believers, this rubric must be understood accordingly; otherwise our system of theology is thrown into utter confusion. He who makes this rubric extend to other children, does so *suo periculo*, and not in accordance with the doctrine of our Church.

I proceed to the Service for Private Baptism, where again *half* a sentence is urged against the view for which I am here contending, while the whole sentence directly supports it. The child who had been privately baptized being brought to the church, the minister is directed to say, "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe, that he *hath* likewise favourably received this present infant; that he *hath* embraced him with the arms of his mercy:" showing, it is said, that we must believe as a matter of *certainty* that the full baptismal blessing was given to it. But how does the sentence proceed?—"and (as he hath promised in his holy word) will give unto him the blessing of eternal life, and make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom." So that we are as undoubtingly to believe that the child *will* be ultimately saved as that the full baptismal blessing *has been* bestowed upon him, and of course therefore our belief of both is not more than a charitable persuasion. And in the Books of Common Prayer previous to 1662, the words afforded, if possible, a still stronger illustration of the meaning of those that preceded them. For they were,—"that he *hath* given unto him the blessing of eternal life, and *made* him partaker of his everlasting kingdom." This phraseology, to one who is versed in such matters, betrays at once the character of the theology of those who originally drew up this Service. But I notice this only incidentally. The reason

* De hujusmodi parvulis *bene spero*, quòd illos videam ex fidelibus parentibus natos,"- "pueros decedentes cum baptismo salvos esse *confidendum est*. (In 1 Cor. vii. 14.)

why I refer to the words is to show the true meaning of the words that precede them. And the alteration in 1662 leaves the argument for so understanding the previous words untouched; which would only have been removed by the insertion of *a condition* in the latter part of the sentence.

Consistently, then, with this exhortation *not to doubt* that the child had been accepted by God in its baptism, the Minister is directed to "receive him as one of the flock of *true* Christian people"* (the words are to be observed), as one who "is now, by the laver of regeneration in baptism, received into the number of the children of God and heirs of everlasting life;" and the declaration is made, that he is "by baptism regenerate." Nor does any one deny, that if the child was accepted of God in its baptism, (which we are exhorted *not to doubt*, that is, as I have shown the words to mean, *charitably* to feel assured of,) this is the proper language to be used. And I shall show immediately that these very expressions have been borrowed from a Liturgy where, from the known sentiments of the author, this interpretation *must* be given.

And be it observed, that though promises are not formally made for the child thus baptized in haste, the recognized nature of the act, as a covenanting act, shows that they are implied.

And the same explanation applies to the similar declaration in the Office for Confirmation, where also the language has been taken from the same Liturgy. Here, indeed, there is another and a stronger reason for the use of such language, because the words are used after the party to be confirmed has in his own person ratified his baptismal promises.

But the most remarkable proof that the hypothetical principle is that upon which the Services of our Prayer Book are constructed, is, that when in 1662, at the last review of the Prayer Book, it seemed desirable to add an Office for the Baptism of Adults, this Service could only be brought into conformity with the rest of the Book by being drawn up on this principle. The same parties that would probably† have contended for the affir-

* In the Books of Common Prayer previous to 1662, the words were "*the* true Christian people."

† I say *probably*, because this was never actually laid down as a principle, even in the Savoy Conference. On one side, the phraseology of the Service, coupled with the interpretation which the dominant party in the Church had then for many years given to it, led many imprudently to affix a sense to it which a little historical research upon the subject would have

matory interpretation of the Service for Infant Baptism as the only admissible one, joined in drawing up a Service for the Baptism of Adults on the hypothetical principle. That such *is* the principle upon which this Service is constructed, the Bishop of Exeter himself admits.* He distinctly says, (and if he did not say so, the 25th Article would at once convict him of teaching doctrine contrary to that of our Church) that when the baptized adult is spoken of as "being now born again," it is the language of "Christian charity." Here then *the principle* for which we contend is yielded. And as to what his Lordship urges, that in the former part of the Service it is intimated, that those only who come with true repentance and faith will be accepted, which is not the case in the Service for Infant Baptism, that does not affect the principle upon which the thanksgiving is founded, which is, that of *charitable presumption*. And the *application* of this principle, when granted, cannot be regulated by the *dictum* of any individuals.

The only shadow of an argument for saying, that the Services show, that the thanksgiving in the case of adults is hypothetical, and affirmative in that of infants, is one which falls to the ground immediately it is examined. The Bishop gives it thus,—

"In the former [the Service for Infant Baptism], the blessing is assured to the baptized infant without reserve: the people are bidden to 'doubt not, but earnestly believe, that God will favourably receive this present infant:' and this is all: while, in the case of adults, the words run, 'doubt ye not, but earnestly believe, that God will favourably receive these present persons, *truly repenting and coming unto him with faith*.'"†

Now, as we have already seen, the words here quoted from the Service for Infant Baptism are far from being "all." The sentence is cut short in the middle, though the latter part shows, that the whole is but an exhortation to the indulgence of a charitable persuasion that so it would be. For the end of the sentence bids us not to doubt of the child being ultimately saved. And the only difference is, that our Church, confining herself within the

---

shown them was not the sense intended by those who put it forth; while, on the other side, this sense was gladly accepted, and the doctrine involved in it defended. But there was no peremptory declaration that this was the only sense which the words admitted.

* Charge, 3rd ed. p. 11. † Charge, p. 10.

limits of Scripture teaching, does not, in the case of infants, state the precise grounds of their acceptance, as she is enabled to do, from Scripture, in the case of adults.

The criticism which the Bishop offers upon the difference in the phraseology of the thanksgivings, I cannot conceive to be worthy of a serious refutation.* A thanksgiving is distinctly offered in the Service for Adults for the gift of spiritual regeneration, where the bestowal of that gift is only a matter of charitable presumption; and that is all with which, in this argument, we are concerned.

But while we may thus derive, from an examination of the Baptismal Services themselves, evidence that our prayers and thanksgivings are offered in the spirit of charitable hope and persuasion, an examination of the other parts of the Prayer Book will show us, that the whole Book is drawn up on this principle, and that the Baptismal Services would be drawn up differently from *all the other Services in it*, if they were not worded with a view to those cases where the full baptismal blessing is experienced. *Every Service in the Book is drawn up on the supposition that the party interested in it is one who is accepted by God.* All the prayers and thanksgivings in the Book proceed upon this *presumption*.

Let us take, for instance, the Burial Service.

In this Service the minister is required *in every case* to give thanks to God that it has pleased him to *take unto himself* the soul of our dear brother departed, and that he has delivered him out of the miseries of this sinful world. The whole Service proceeds upon the *presumption* that the party buried is a true and faithful servant of Christ. Here of course it is impossible to deny that the language is only that of charitable hope and presumption. But it is as definite and express as that used in the Service for Infant Baptism.

Hence the Nonconformists who objected to the Baptismal Service on the ground of its affirming the spiritual regeneration of all infants, equally objected to the Burial Service as affirming the salvation of all that were buried.†

* I have already noticed it in my reply to the Charge, entitled, "A Vindication of the Defence of the XXXIX Articles, &c." But I do not enter upon the matter again here. It is with unwillingness, and only in a case of necessity, that I touch the addresses of a Bishop to his Clergy; but few, I suppose, will hesitate to admit that, in the present case, I was more than justified in publishing a reply.

† Thus Calamy, in his Life of Baxter, states the objections of the Non-

And yet, strangely enough, they who know, or ought to know, that the Nonconformists and their modern successors have objected equally and *on the same grounds* to both the Baptismal and Burial Services, while they cannot but admit that the objections thus made are unfounded in the case of the latter, urge the objections made against the former as showing that those Services really mean what the Dissenters charge them with meaning.*

Take again the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. How are we to understand the words,—"I absolve thee from all thy sins?" Clearly as spoken on *the charitable presumption* that the professions of faith and repentance have been sincere.

So in the Offices for the Solemnization of Matrimony and the Churching of Women, we find these declarations respecting the state of mind of the parties concerned, put into the mouths of those present,—"who put their trust in thee"—"Who putteth her trust in thee." Is this the language of certainty or charity? Are we bound to believe that every body married, and every woman churched, is a true believer?

And such instances might be multiplied to almost any extent.

Even the Laudian divines in the Savoy Conference were compelled to adopt this mode of explaining some expressions in the Prayer Book that were objected to. Thus, after defending the words in the Confirmation Service, "Who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants," &c., they add,—

"And it is CHARITABLY PRESUMED that notwithstanding the frailties and slips of their childhood they have not totally lost what was in baptism conferred upon them; and THEREFORE adds, 'Strengthen them, we beseech thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them their [thy] manifold gifts of grace.'"†

conformists to this Service. "They could not consent to pronounce all saved that are buried except the unbaptized, excommunicate, and self murtherers. . . . . Whereas the Scripture saith expressly, that neither adulterers, nor fornicators, nor drunkards, shall ever go to heaven, yet hereby must they have obliged themselves, in perfect opposition, when they buried any known adulterer, fornicator, or drunkard, to declare and avouch that his soul was assuredly gone thither. They could not see how charity would excuse dangerous errors and falsehood," &c. &c. Calamy's Life of Baxter. 2d ed. 1713. vol. 1, pp. 224—226.

* See the Bishop of Exeter's Charge, pp. 51, 52.

† Cardwell's Conferences, 2d ed. 1841. p. 359.

Again, in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, to the request that the words, "I absolve thee," may be changed to, "I pronounce thee absolved if thou doest truly repent and believe," they reply,—

"The form of absolution in the Liturgy is more agreeable to the Scriptures than that which they desire, it being said in St. John xx., 'Whose sins you remit, they are remitted,' not, Whose sins you pronounce remitted; and the *condition* needs not to be expressed, being *always necessarily* UNDERSTOOD."*

Again, in the Office for the Burial of the Dead, to the objection to the words, "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take unto himself," &c., they reply,—

"We see not why these words may not be said of any person whom we dare not say is damned, and it were a breach of charity to say so even of those whose repentance we do not see; for whether they do not inwardly and heartily repent, even at the last act, *who knows?* And that God will not even then pardon them upon such repentance, *who dares say?* It is better to be CHARITABLE AND HOPE THE BEST, than rashly to condemn."†

And yet in the face of all this, a party among us, finding it convenient, for the inculcation of their own peculiar views, to interpret the prayers and thanksgivings of one particular Service as speaking the language of certainty, not of charitable presumption, talk (to use the language of one of their leaders) of "the truly precise, and accurate, and plain teaching of the Prayer-book,"‡ and deduce from those prayers and thanksgivings so understood, (in opposition to the principle of interpretation which they are themselves compelled to apply to other parts of the same Book,) articles of faith which they call upon all the clergy, at the peril of being denounced as dishonest, to maintain and defend. And they assert, that dogmatical *inferences* so raised out of the Liturgy are to form the rule of interpretation by which the Articles, drawn up as a dogmatic standard of faith, are to be construed!

Nothing can show more plainly than this attempt to set up certain passages in one part of the Prayer Book, (understood by a different principle of interpretation from what is applied in

* Ib. p. 361. † Ib. pp. 361, 362. ‡ Charge, 3d ed. p. 11.

another,) as a standard of faith, how utterly unfit a Liturgical Book is to serve such a purpose. That the doctrine of a Church is indirectly and to a certain extent illustrated by her devotional books, in their broad and evident features, is no doubt very true. But to turn the verbal expressions of prayer and praise into a confession of faith, is to apply the Liturgy to a purpose for which it was never intended, and for which it is utterly unfit.

§ 2. *The judgment of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr, upon our Baptismal Services for Infants.*

One of the most direct and satisfactory proofs of the meaning intended to be attached to our Liturgical Services in the point now under consideration, would obviously be, some evidence of the light in which they were regarded, at the time of their publication, by those whose doctrinal sentiments are beyond dispute. Fortunately, then, it so happens that we have clear and distinct evidence of the judgment of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr respecting them. And their doctrine has been so fully placed before the reader, that no doubt can remain on his mind respecting its real nature.

In the year 1551, Martin Bucer, then by Cranmer's appointment Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, was requested by Cranmer critically to review the Book of Common Prayer (of course of the edition of 1549), and place before him his animadversions upon it. That judgment, carefully and elaborately drawn up, in the form of a full critical commentary upon every part of the book, still exists.* The question then immediately occurs, Does he, holding the views we know he did respecting baptism, make any remark upon the Baptismal Service as opposed to sound doctrine in the point here in question, or suggest any alteration (as he had been requested to do wherever he thought it necessary) in the passages which the Bishop of Exeter maintains admit no other interpretation than what he gives them? The answer is, that he does nothing of the kind. He treats the whole of them as perfectly consistent with his views, so far as regards the point now in question, and offers not one word of

* It occupies pp. 456–503 in Buceri Scripta Anglicana. Basil. 1577. fol.

suggestion for the alteration of any one of them, while the minuteness of his criticism on other parts of the Service shows how fully his attention had been directed to it.

On the contrary, he makes such remarks as the following. Urging the administration of baptism at the time when the congregation is likely to be the largest, he says,—

"Whoever recognize the influence of *regeneration* and the amplitude of the divine blessing which is conferred by baptism, will readily approve of this."*

And, recommending simplicity in the Baptismal rites, he remarks,—

"It is the part of Christians to worship the Lord in spirit and in truth, and nowhere to act inconsiderately and with levity, but least of all, at the so holy mysteries of our redemption and *regeneration to eternal life*."†

There are several other passages of the same kind,‡ all of which, if understood according to the Bishop of Exeter's mode of interpreting such statements, would imply that *all* infants indiscriminately were regenerated at baptism; an interpretation entirely at variance with his real views.

He adopts fully, therefore, the language of the Baptismal Service, but the sense in which he understood it is apparent from the extracts I have given above from his *contemporary* writings.

And accordingly, in his comment on the Confirmation Service, when advising that children that have been baptized should not be admitted to the Communion merely on the ground of their being able to repeat the Catechism, but those only who exhibit some *marks of regeneration*, he observes,—

"Those more backward ones, IF SO BE THEY ARE BORN OF GOD, would be the better excited seriously to learn the things that are

---

* Hoc facile probaverint, quicunque vim regenerationis et amplitudinem divini beneficii, quod baptismate confertur, agnoscent. Cens. in Ord. Eccles. Inter Scripta Anglic. p. 477.

† Ib. p. 478.

‡ As for instance the following,—Cæteri habeantur in Catechumenis dum se catechizare patiantur, dumque ipse Dominus daret suam in baptismate oblatam regenerationem solide recipere, atque in vita quoque proferre. (p. 484.)

Christ's by the example of those who for their merit should be placed before them."*

Here then we see, at the very period when the Baptismal Service was first put forth, an able and experienced divine, the man selected by Cranmer to give his judgment upon that formulary with the rest of the Prayer Book, *knowing the meaning intended by it*, and holding that certain infants *only* are regenerated in baptism, and the rest never regenerated at all, giving nevertheless his voluntary and complete approval to it. Are we then to be now told, that none can honestly use it but those that believe that *all* infants are regenerated in baptism? With all impartial persons, this fact alone is sufficient to settle the question.

But we have also another testimony of the same unanswerable kind to the meaning of our Baptismal Service; namely, the approval of it by Peter Martyr.

I have already observed, that Peter Martyr was made by Cranmer, in 1548, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Shortly after the publication of the Book of Common Prayer in 1549, it was submitted to *him* as well as to Bucer for his censure;† and we learn from his Letter to Bucer on this subject, that having been supplied with a Latin version of it by Cheke, he sent to the Archbishop some "Annotations" upon it; and having afterwards found, on the receipt of Bucer's "Censura" on the book, that the translation he had used was imperfect, he shortly after sent to the Archbishop a few additional "Brief Articles," showing his agreement with Bucer in the remarks he had made. Unfortunately these "Annotations" and "Articles" do not seem to have been preserved, but his letter to Bucer fully supplies the place so far as our present subject is concerned. For in it he states his full agreement with Bucer in the matters he

* Tardiores illi, *siquidem nati ex Deo sint*, exemplo horum qui eis suo merito anteponerentur, ad serio discendum quæ Christi sunt magis excitarentur. (Ib. p. 483.) He remarks also in a previous page,—"Nihil igitur in his mysteriis sunt panis et vinum.... quam signa corporis et sanguinis Domini; sed non absentium omnino: verum hujusmodi signa, quibus Christus Dominus una cum verbis suis seipsum nobis iterum præbet, communicat, unit; non minus quam. ..tinctio baptismatis signum est ablutionis a peccatis, quæ *baptisma rite suscipientibus* tam certò traditur et percipitur (*sed fide*) quam corpus ipsam percipit aquæ ablutionem." (Ib. p. 475.)

† See Martyr's Letter to Bucer in Strype's Cranmer; Documents, No. 61.

had objected to, and adds words which show that there was *only one point of importance which had struck him as objectionable which Bucer had passed over,* namely, a regulation respecting the Communion of the Sick.* But, if the Baptismal Service had been opposed to his views, he must necessarily have found fault, and great fault, with Bucer, for omitting to object to this. All parties will agree that it was far too important a point to be lightly passed over. It is clear, therefore, that Peter Martyr also, like Bucer, approved of the Service.

Now, certainly, after the evidence of his sentiments given in a previous chapter, there can be no question in what sense Peter Martyr, when requested by Archbishop Cranmer to review and pass his judgment upon the Book of Common Prayer, gave his approval to our Baptismal Service, and therefore no question about the intended meaning of that Service.

And it is worth remembering, that it was Peter Martyr, whom Cranmer selected to aid him, when publicly offering, at the commencement of Mary's reign, to defend the Book of Common Prayer in a public disputation.

"Though that many," he says, "do maliciously report of Mr. Peter Martyr, that he is a man of no learning, and therefore not to be credited, yet, if the Queen's Highness will grant it, I with the said Mr. Peter, and other four or five which I will choose, will by God's grace take upon us to defend, that not only the Common Prayers of the Church, *the ministration of the Sacraments,* and other rites and ceremonies, but also that *all the doctrine and religion* set forth by our sovereign lord King Edward the Sixth, is more pure and according to God's word, than any other that hath been used in England these thousand years; *so that God's word may be the judge,* and that the reasons and proofs upon both parties may be set out in writing."†

So that Cranmer himself, knowing well Peter Martyr's views on the point, selects him to be joined with himself in defending the Scriptural character of that very Service which we are now

---

* In prioribus adnotationibus omnia ferme quæ te offenderunt a me fuerunt adnotata . . . Tantùm sum miratus, quomodo præterieris de Communione ægrotorum id reprehendere, &c . . . . *Hæc sunt quæ putaci alicujus momenti,* et cur omiseris, non satis intelligo. In omnibus autem, quæ censuisti emendanda, tuæ sententiæ scripsi.

† Declaration of Abp. Cranmer respecting untrue report, &c. Works, P. S. ed. Vol. 1. p. 429.

told cannot be interpreted in conformity with Peter Martyr's doctrine.

And these cases of Peter Martyr and Bucer prove much more, we must observe, than merely *their* view of the Service, and that such a view is tenable. They go far to prove that this was the view of those that put forth the Service; for it is incredible that, knowing as they must the views and intentions of those who put it forth, if it had been *intended* that it should be understood in the sense affixed to it by the Bishop of Exeter, they should not, with their views on the subject, have proposed some alteration. Their approval, under the circumstances in which it was given, goes far to show the sense in which the Service was *intended to be understood by those who drew it up.* Whatever may be said as to the probability of Cranmer's drawing it up so that it might admit of more than one sense,—and no doubt there was a desire to retain as much of the old baptismal form as possible, in order to give no unnecessary offence to the Romanists and the popular mind, (and we are now suffering from that policy, though perhaps right at the time,)—one thing is perfectly clear, that if the Service had been drawn up with the intention of excluding the notion that some infants are not regenerated in baptism, Peter Martyr and Bucer must necessarily, with their views, have objected to it.

§ 3. *Luther's Service for Infant Baptism, expressed in similar terms to ours, and understood by him in the hypothetical sense.*

In a preceding page* I have given some extracts from Luther's Larger Catechism, first published in 1529, showing his views as to the character in which infants are to be *presumed* to come to the font, and obtain the blessing. "We bring a child," he says, "to a minister of the Church to be baptized, *in this hope and persuasion, that it certainly believes.*" And he maintains that baptism is profitable only when there is faith, in the case both of children and adults.

I do not stop to discuss the question of the correctness of such doctrine, because it is immaterial to the argument I am about

---

* See pp. 158, 159, above.

to draw from Luther's view on this point. But I would observe, that though the early divines of the Protestant Churches did not generally adopt precisely his view, and express themselves as if they considered an infant capable of the acts of faith (which Luther seems to have held), they did speak of an infant as capable of the seed, or principle, or incipient stage of faith.

But the question with which we are here concerned, is, What was the nature of the Baptismal Service sanctioned by Luther at the time he published these views? This question we are fortunately able to answer. In 1523, Luther published in German a Form for the Baptism of Infants, of which he put forth a second and revised edition in 1524; and this second edition *remained ever after, as far as he was concerned, the standard Formula for the Churches of his communion.*

Now in this Baptismal Service the following prayer (almost identical with that in the old Form) is directed to be used after the child has been baptized:—

"Almighty God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who HATH REGENERATED THEE BY WATER AND THE HOLY GHOST, AND FORGIVEN THEE ALL THY SINS, confirm thee by his grace unto eternal life."*

Here, then, as in our own Form, spiritual regeneration is affirmed to have taken place. But this is the Form of one who himself expressly tells us at the same time, that children are brought to be baptized in the *hope* and *persuasion* that they believe, and that without such faith baptism is of no avail.

It is impossible to deny, then, that this the earliest Protestant Form, was understood *by him who drew it up*, in the sense which we maintain is that which ought to be attributed to our own.

Nor is it any answer to the argument we derive from this case, to say, that our Reformers did not hold the precise view held by Luther, as expressed in his Catechism. This is a point immaterial to the question. I adduce this Form merely to shew the admissibility of the hypothetical principle of interpretation

* For the convenience of the reader, I have placed the whole of this little tract of Luther, – according to the Latin translation of it first published in 1526, and reprinted by Chancellor Pfaff, in his edition of the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church, – at the end of this volume. See the first four pages of the Appendix. The original German of both editions may be found in the 10th vol. of Walch's Edition of Luther's Works.

in such a Service, and to prove that one of the most eminent of the Reformers adopted it. And our Reformers may have drawn up a Service on the same *principle*, though taking a somewhat different view of the cause qualifying infants for the reception of Divine grace in baptism.

Nor again, is it of any importance what doctrine the Lutherans subsequently held as to the effects of infant baptism. I am quite prepared to admit, that the followers of Luther subsequently took a different view from that of Luther himself, as to this matter, (as they did in several others*) and herein differed from the "Reformed," as the other Protestant Churches were called, and our own among them. But viewing the Service as connected with Luther himself, a comparison of it with his Catechism shows, that he must have understood the words, affirming spiritual regeneration to have taken place, in a *hypothetical* sense.

And before I pass on, I would point the reader's attention to a passage in Luther's prefatory remarks to this Form, as affording us something like a key to the solution of the difficulty (if difficulty there be) in understanding why such phraseology should have been adopted by men holding such views as those of Luther. He says,—

"I did not wish to alter many things, though I could have wished that the Form was better furnished. For it had careless authors who did not sufficiently consider the importance of Baptism. But I leave the most part unchanged, lest weak consciences complain, that I have instituted a new Baptism, and lest those already baptized complain that they are not rightly baptized. For, as has been observed, human additions are not of much consequence, so that Baptism itself is administered with the word of God, *true faith, and earnest calling upon God*."†

Here we see, *distinctly expressed*, the motive for originally retaining in the first Protestant Form (a Form, which, as I shall show presently, exercised, through the Cologne Liturgy, an influence upon our own) as much as possible of that which had long been in use in the Church; namely, a charitable regard for

* On the difference of Luther's views on various points from those of a large number of his followers, see Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Cent. xvi. Sect. iii. Pt. II. ch. 1. § 27 et seq. And the note of Dr. Maclaine in his translation of Mosheim on § 30. (Ed. 1826. iv. 283.)

† See third page of Appendix.

the feelings of those who might have misconstrued the effects of the change. And where Protestant doctrine was sincerely embraced, there no danger was apprehended of these statements being interpreted in the Romish sense; the words being as capable of being understood in a sense different from the Popish as the words of our Ordination Service; the Protestant interpretation of which is, as Archbishop Whitgift tells us,* very different from the Popish.

Thus, even supposing the words to present a difficulty, the Romanizing party among us would be availing themselves of language left in such Formularies by the conciliatory policy and charitable feelings of the Reformers towards those who were not quite emancipated from the errors of Romanism, to turn out of the Reformed Church those who hold the sentiments of the Reformers themselves.

§ 4. *The meaning of the Baptismal Service demonstrated by a comparison of it with a similar Formulary, drawn up by Bucer himself, in a Liturgy from which our own Office is admitted to be "freely borrowed."*

In a preceding chapter I have very fully shown what were the views held by Bucer on the question of the effects of baptism in infants, and we have already seen how important is the evidence deducible from a proof of his doctrine, to show the doctrine of our own Church on the subject. He was placed by Archbishop Cranmer as Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge; he was extolled by Archbishops Parker and Whitgift as a most able and sound theologian; our Baptismal Service was submitted to him for his remarks upon it, and he approved of it in all matters affecting the question now before us.

But there is another circumstance connected with his case, which affords a still more conclusive argument in favour of the position for which I am here contending.

A Liturgy remains, of which nearly the whole, including the Baptismal and Confirmation Offices, was drawn up by Bucer; and it appears by a comparison of this Liturgy with our own,

* Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, pp. 227, 228.

that our Liturgy closely followed that of Bucer, and was freely borrowed from it. Every single expression in our own Baptismal Services that has ever been quoted as evidence, that our Church maintains the doctrine of spiritual regeneration invariably accompanying the administration of baptism to infants, is to be found (and in some places even stronger language is found) in the Liturgy of Bucer.

This Liturgy occurs in a work drawn up by Bucer in 1543, at the request of Herman Archbishop of Cologne. A few words on the history of this transaction may be useful to the general reader. Herman de Wida, Archbishop of Cologne, becoming dissatisfied with the corrupt doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome, about the year 1539 or 1540, invited Bucer and Melancthon to his Palace at Bonn, to aid him in the work of Reformation. Melancthon was at that time unable to comply with his request, but Bucer went and took up his abode with him at Bonn for a time, at the end of the year 1541, and was commissioned by the Archbishop to draw up a book for the reformation of the Doctrine and Offices of the Church.* While this work was proceeding, he was joined, at the commencement of 1543, by Melancthon, who assisted him in the prosecution of his labours. But the portions drawn up by each may be learnt from the following extract of a letter from Melancthon to Caspar Cruciger.

"I wrote to you before, that the Bishop intended to follow the Nuremberg form; and the book was commenced before my arrival, the Nuremberg Liturgy being taken as the model. Bucer retained the greater part, and enlarged some of the Articles, as he is diffuse. After I had read over the whole, he committed to me the Articles, Concerning three Hypostases, Concerning the Creation, Concerning original sin, Concerning the righteousness of faith and of works, Concerning the Church, Concerning repentance. I have hitherto been engaged upon these, and I have read *what he himself has composed concerning the ceremonies of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*"†

* "Scripta ad historiam Reformationis Coloniensis pertinentia recenset Saligius P. 1. Histor. Aug. Conf. p. 541, seq." Camerarii Vita Melancth. § 59, Halae 1777. 8vo. p. 203.

† "Scripsi vobis antea, Episcopum secuturum esse formam Noribergensem: *eratque ante meum adventum institutus liber* ad exemplum Noribergense. *Retinuit plerasque* Bucerus, quosdam articulos auxit, ut est copiosus. Mihi, cum omnia relegissem, attribuit articulos *περι τριων ὑποστασεων*, de cre-

Hence we learn that the Baptismal Service in this work was not only approved by Bucer, but *drawn up by him*, the Nuremberg form being taken as the ground-work.

This work was published in German in 1543, under the title, "Von Gottes genaden unser Hermans Ertzbischoffs zu Coln, &c. einfaltigs bedencken, &c."*

A Latin translation was also published at Bonn, in 1545, fol. under the title,—"Nostra Hermanni, ex gratia Dei Archiepiscopi Coloniensis et Principis Electoris, simplex ac pia Deliberatio, qua ratione Cristiana et in verbo Dei fundata Reformatio doctrinæ, administrationis divinorum Sacramentorum, ceremoniarum, totiusque curæ animarum, et aliorum ministeriorum Ecclesiasticorum, apud eos qui nostræ pastorali curæ commendati sunt, tantisper instituenda sit, donec Dominus dederit constitui meliorem, vel per liberam et Christianam Synodum, sive generalem sive nationalem, vel per Ordines Imperii Nationis Germanicæ in Spiritu Sancto congregatos."†

A translation of this work into English (made apparently from the Latin) appeared in this country in 1547, and a second and revised edition in 1548, under the following title,—"A Simple and Religious Consultation of us Herman, &c., &c. [as in the Latin.] Perused by the translator thereof, and amended in many places. 1548. Imprinted at London by Jhon Daye and William Seres." A summary of its contents is given by Strype ;‡ who remarks,—

"This book shewed itself in this kingdom at this juncture, undoubtedly, by the means of Archbishop Cranmer, and probably of the Protector, as a silent invitation to the people of the land to a reformation, and as a motive to incline them to be willing to forsake the old superstition, when they should see the beauty of a reformed Church so lively laid before them in this book. And perhaps it was

---

ationc, de peccato originis, de justitia fidei, et operum, de Ecclesia, de pœnitentia. In his consumpsi tempus hactenus, et legi *de ceremoniis Baptismi et Cœnæ Domini, quæ ipse composuit*." Melancthon. Epistolæ. Lond. 1642. fol. col. 546, 547.

* "Prima editio in lucem prodiit Buschovii [Busshoven], secunda Bonnæ a. 1543, tertia ibidem a. 1544, latina ejus translatio etiam Bonnæ a. 1545. Sed Germanica tamen clarior est et amplior." Fabric. Hist. Biblioth. Fabric. Pt. 4. p. 188. Wolfenb. 1721. 4to.

† Copies are in the Cambridge University Library, G. 9. 20, &c.

‡ Memor. II. 1. 42 - 44. Oxf. ed.

intended to serve as some pattern to the heads and governors of this Church, whereby to direct their pains they were now ere long to take about the emendation of religious worship."*

And before I pass on, I would observe, that the Nuremberg Form here alluded to, is that published in 1533 by the Marquis of Brandenburg, for the States of Brandenburg and Nuremberg, in which the Baptismal Service is *verbatim* that of Luther according to the second edition published in 1524; which we have just been considering.

In consequence of the great rarity of these Liturgies, I have inserted in the Appendix to this work, the Baptismal and Confirmation Services of the Cologne Liturgy, as given in the Latin edition mentioned above, and also a translation of the Baptismal Service of the Nuremberg Liturgy of 1533. The reader, therefore, may there see the whole of these Services, as they stand in the original works.

The most convincing proof, perhaps, to all parties of the correctness of the reference I am now making to this Cologne Liturgy, in illustration of the meaning of our own, will be found in an extract from Archbishop Laurence's Bampton Lectures, in which, through a remarkable mistake as to Bucer's doctrine, and a supposition of his being a Lutheran, and therefore participating in the sentiments generally adopted by *the followers* of Luther, the Archbishop has (most unfortunately for his own argument) referred to this Liturgy in support of his own view of the meaning of our Baptismal Service. I quote the passage as proving, upon the testimony of an adversary, the complete identity in the tone of the Cologne Liturgy and our own on the question we are now discussing; and that, in fact, our own, particularly in the Baptismal Office, was (to use the Archbishop's own words) *"freely borrowed"* from the Cologne.

In the eighth Sermon of his Bampton Lectures, he remarks that those who contend that in our Baptismal Service the thanksgiving for regeneration is "the judgment of charity," "forget, or perhaps do not know," "that the Office of our own Church is *principally borrowed from that of the Lutherans*, whose well-known sentiments on the subject it is unnecessary to repeat." (p. 183. 3d ed.)

* Ib. p. 41

And in his note upon these words, after quoting the passage given above from Melancthon's Letters, to shew that the Nuremberg Liturgy was taken as the groundwork of the Cologne Liturgy, and remarking that the Baptismal Service in the former was taken *verbatim* from Luther's Baptismal Service as published in a second edition in 1527, (he should have said in 1524,) he proceeds to say,—

"Our Offices bear *evident marks of having been freely borrowed from the Cologne Liturgy;* liberally imitating, but not servilely copying it. *In our Baptismal Service the resemblance between the two productions is particularly striking;* NOR IN THE COLOGNE FORM IS THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL REGENERATION AND ELECTION IN BAPTISM LESS PROMINENT THAN IN OUR OWN."

And then giving some extracts in proof of this (which I shall notice presently), he adds,—

"That these passages express something more than the language of hope, will not, perhaps, be controverted. It should, however, be recollected, that when *the Lutherans* [!] spoke thus certainly of the regeneration and election of *every* infant in Baptism, they attributed nothing to the sacramental efficacy, but all to the Divine promise. Hence our Church strongly urges that promise, as the sure and only ground of our confidence." (pp. 378, 380.)

A more unfortunate reference, so far as the Archbishop's views are concerned, never was made; for, as we have already seen, Bucer's doctrine was entirely inconsistent with the interpretation thus given to the Baptismal Service inserted by him in the Cologne Liturgy; and we have the Archbishop's own confession, that that Service was precisely similar to ours in the very point now in question. And how our respected Prelate could have put down Bucer as a Lutheran, when it is so notorious that he belonged to the "Reformed" party, I cannot understand. To say nothing of the extracts which have been already given from his works, we have seen that he appeared at the Conference at Wittemberg, in 1536, between the Lutherans and the Reformed, at the head of the Reformed divines. And his works are placed by the great theological bibliographer of Germany, J. G. Walchius, (in his "Bibliotheca Theologica"), among those of the "Reformed" divines as distinguished from the "Lutheran."

Nor does the fact that the Cologne Baptismal Service has borrowed from the Nuremberg Form, and so from the Form originally drawn up by Luther, (for the Archbishop has spoken quite correctly in saying that the two latter are identical), make the slightest difference in favor of the Archbishop's argument. For that Form was, as we have already seen, understood by Luther on the hypothetical principle. And in fact, the Archbishop's own quotations are from passages wholly due to Bucer's pen, no trace of them occurring in the Nuremberg Form.

In short, the Archbishop has made a series of mistakes, and, in consequence, landed himself upon ground where all that is left to him is to surrender at discretion. He has imagined Bucer to be a Lutheran; he has confounded the views of Luther on the subject with those afterwards adopted by his followers; and then, supposing himself to be on safe ground, triumphantly pointed to the evident proofs of our Liturgy having been freely borrowed from the Cologne, as showing that his interpretation of our Liturgy is the true one, when they in fact clearly prove the direct contrary.

Bearing in mind, then, the views of Bucer, it will be desirable to compare certain expressions in the Cologne Form with similar ones in our own; as nothing can more strongly show the absurdity of contending, that certain passages in our Service must be interpreted in the sense which our opponents affix to them, than the use of similar language, *by Bucer*, in that very Baptismal Formula from which our own has "freely borrowed" them.

And I know not that I can do better than give first the passages which Archbishop Laurence has selected to prove, that our Service is mainly derived from the Cologne; only taking the liberty of occasionally making the extracts and references (of which the latter are singularly faulty) more accordant with the original.

The Archbishop quotes from the Latin copy, and observes,—

"The sense of the following passages cannot easily be mistaken:—'Baptismus est Sacramentum regenerationis, quo Christo Domino inserimur, incorporamur, sepelimur in mortem ejus, induimur eo [the original has *ea*, probably by a misprint], et [atque] efficimur per eum filii et hæredes Dei.' Nostra Hermanni, &c., simplex ac pia Deliberatio, &c., p. 69. [fol. 68.] ed. 1545. 'Sed Deus Pater, pro ineffa-

bili sua [clementia et] misericordia erga genus humanum, Filium suum misit, ut mundum servaret, quare etiam et hos infantes servatos vult. Ille peccata totius mundi tulit, et tam parvulos, quam nos adultos, a peccatis, morte, diabolo, et æterna damnatione [condemnatione] liberavit, et salvos fecit, qui voluit sibi offerri parvulos, ut iis benedictionem impartiretur. Quare pro immensa [*dele* immensa] Christiana pietate vestra, hunc puerum assumite, et ad Christum adducite, et offerte piis vestris precibus, quo peccatorum suorum ab illo consequatur remissionem, transferatur in regnum gratiæ, ereptus e [a] tyrannide Satanæ, et constituatur hæres æternæ salutis. Et vobis certissimum sit, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum hoc opus charitatis vestræ erga hunc infantem clementissime respecturum.' p. 78. [fol. 70.] 'Wherefore we being thus persuaded of the good will of our heavenly Father towards this infant, declared by his Son Jesus Christ, and nothing doubting, but that he favourably alloweth this charitable work of ours,' &c. 'His verbis et huic facto Domini nostri Jesu Christi super illos fidem habete, nec dubitate cum et vestros infantes sic in sacro baptismate suscepturum, et complexurum esse ulnis misericordiæ suæ, et benedictionem vitæ æternæ, et sempiternam regni Dei communionem iis [eis] collaturum.' p. 72. [fol. 74.] 'Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that he will likewise favourably receive this present infant; that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy; that he will give unto him the blessing of eternal life; and make him partaker of his everlasting kingdom.' 'Itaque ex baptismate certo statuimus, nos Deo acceptos et fœdere gratiæ sempiterno ei conjunctos esse.' p. 71. [fol. 71.] 'Debent pastores subinde accuratius et solidius explicare et excutere ratum habere Deum baptisma infantium nostrorum, infantes per baptismum adoptare in filios, et constituere hæredes gratiæ suæ et vitæ æternæ.' p. 75. [Both passage and reference are here very incorrectly given. I quote the following from the original. 'Ita et dogmata illa..... debent pastores subinde accuratius et solidius explicare et excutere, ut de peccato originali, de baptismate infantum, de justicia fidei; et hæc ex Scripturis sacris docebunt, ut de peccato originis, quam horrendum malum sit, ... Item ratum habere Deum,' &c. (as above.) fol. 64. The words "ratum habere," &c. are connected with "docebunt" in the part omitted.] 'Quod cum fecerint, ne dubitent infantem suum vere baptizatum, peccatis ablutum, in Christo renatum, et filium hæredemque Dei factum esse.' p. 77. [fol. 76.] 'Ex his ergo Christi verbis certi sumus infantes, quicunque Christo juxta verbum ejus offeruntur, pertinere ad regnum Dei, esse filios Dei, membra Christi.' Ibid. [fol. 77.] 'Hunc igitur infantulum filium et hæredem Dei, fratrem et cohæredem Christi, membrum Christi, et vestrum in Christo,' &c. p. 78. [fol. 77.] That these passages express some-

thing more than the language of hope, will not perhaps be controverted." (pp. 378—380.)

These passages, then, clearly show, what strong expressions may be used on this subject in a sense wholly different from that which some modern divines would attach to them, and moreover that they were *so* used in the Liturgy from which our own has confessedly borrowed them. And the remarks of Archbishop Laurence upon them, written under an erroneous impression as to the views of their author, are the best testimony we could have, to show the groundlessness of similar confident assertions as to the meaning of our own Service. Words used by Bucer from the conviction that it is our duty to treat all infants, in the spirit of charitable hope, as belonging to God's elect people who will all finally be saved, are interpreted by the Archbishop as maintaining the doctrine that all infants are equally partakers of God's grace; and hence his extraordinary mistake that Bucer meant by these passages to assert "universal regeneration and election in Baptism," a doctrine which Bucer would have entirely repudiated.

Further, we often find the following words of the Prayer in the Confirmation Service urged as a proof of our Church holding the universal regeneration of infants in Baptism,—"Almighty and ever-living God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins, strengthen them, we beseech thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them thy manifold gifts of grace," &c.

Now let us observe the similar Prayer in the Confirmation Service of the Cologne Liturgy.

"Almighty and merciful God, heavenly Father, which only workest in us to will and to perform the things that please thee, and be good indeed, we beseech thee for these children whom thou hast given to thy Church and HAST BEGOTTEN AGAIN TO THYSELF BY HOLY BAPTISM, (tibi Sacro Baptismate regenuisti) and in whom thou hast poured that light, that they acknowledge and confess before the congregation thy grace.... confirm this thy work, which thou hast wrought in them, increase in them the gift of thy Spirit," &c. (fol. 179.—*Lat.* fol. 81, 82.)*

* I quote from the English Edition of 1548, as the reader will find the Latin in the Appendix to this work.

Of the two the latter is the strongest, by its specific reference to "baptism." And it may show us how utterly useless is another reference often made by our opponents, namely, that to the words that occur in the Service headed "Private Baptism," where it is said that the child is "by the laver of regeneration in baptism received into the number of the children of God," &c. We have indeed very similar phraseology in the corresponding prayer of the Cologne Liturgy.

"Lord God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hast begotten again this infant of water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given him *in holy baptism* remission of all sins, confirm the same with thy grace, and guide and further *this new life which thou hast given*, and finish it up, whereunto thou hast bound [obsignasti] the infant with this holy sacrament." (fol. 171.—*Lat.* fol. 77.)

And while noticing this Service, I would direct the reader's attention to some expressions occurring in what I may call the rubrical part of it, which are much stronger than any in our own Services. After directing a sick infant to be baptized at once with merely the necessary words accompanying the act, it is added,—

"Which done, let them not doubt but that their infant is truly baptized, washen from sins, born again in Christ, and made the son and heir of God; let them then give thanks to God for this his so great benefits," &c.

"Further, if it chance that the infant so baptized at home do live, it is convenient that he be brought afterward to the temple of his parents, kinsfolks, and godfathers, which must come with a good company, and religiously, as men that ought to *give thanks for this exceeding great benefit of regeneration ministered to their infant*, and to offer him to God and his Saviour in the congregation. The pastors then shall ask these men after what sort and with what words they baptized the infant, &c. . . . which if they shall answer that they called God upon the child, and prayed for him, and baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, *and that they believe that he is truly cleansed from sins and born again to God*, the pastors must *confirm them in this belief*, and in no wise baptize such an infant again." (fol. 168, 169.—*Lat.* fol. 76.)

So that the parties bringing the infant who had been privately baptized, were actually to testify *their belief* that he was thus "*truly cleansed from sins and born again to God.*"

But in the immediate context the minister is directed to utter words which show at once that the proper effect of the Sacrament was only to be expected after the prayer of faith. For it is added;—

"For in what place soever *they that believe in him* come together in his name, he is present in the midst of them, and *when he is called upon through faith*, he worketh in his word and sacraments, [invocatus fide efficax est in verbo et sacramentis suis] and he performeth in deed whatsoever he offereth in his sacraments and promiseth in his words." (fol. 170.—*Lat.* fol. 77.)

But, earnestly desirous to keep in view the *appropriate blessings* of this Sacrament, Bucer speaks of them continually in the strongest terms. He says;—

"The parents and godfathers. . . . shall be diligently warned by the pastors of the exceeding benefit of regeneration in Christ, which they desire to their children. Item of the horrible fall and guilt, from which the infants are delivered in baptism through Christ." (fol. 154. —*Lat.* fol. 69.)

"The pastors shall labour, as much as is possible, that this most holy sacrament of baptism, which is the first adoption receiving and entering into the kingdom of Christ, be not administered and received, but before the whole congregation with great gravity and reverence." (fol. 155.—*Lat.* fol. 70.)

"Baptism. . . . is the first entrance unto all the benefits of God, and to the blessed fellowship of all saints." (fol, 158.—*Lat.* fol 71.)

And after the act of baptism the same prayer occurs as that given in Luther's Service already quoted (and which is very similar to the prayer ordinarily found in the Romish Rituals in the same place), containing a declaration as to the regeneration of the child by water *and the Holy Ghost* having taken place.

"The Almighty everlasting God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten thee again with water and the Holy Ghost, and hath forgiven thee all thy sins, confirm thee with his grace unto everlasting life."* (fol. 167.—*Lat.* fol. 75.)

This prayer, which is nearly *verbatim* the old Roman Catholic form, was retained by Bucer as altogether consistent

* Omnipotens æternus Deus, et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, *qui regenuit te aqua et Spiritu Sancto, remisitque tibi omnia peccata tua*, confirmet te sua gratia, ad vitam æternam. Amen. (fol. 75.)

with his own view, and with those portions of the Service of which he was the author, but in a sense different from that in which it was used by Romanists.

And in our first Liturgy of 1549, the prayer used in this place was precisely that which had been previously in use; which in 1552 was exchanged for the thanksgiving which now stands there, which of course cannot be considered as stronger in favor of the actual regeneration of all the baptized than the declaration contained in this prayer.

After a review of these passages, then, coupled with a knowledge of Bucer's views, it is surely impossible for the most sceptical opponent of the hypothetical principle of interpretation to deny any longer its applicability to Services so constructed; and that our own were drawn up on this principle.*

But the evidence derived from this Cologne Service is of so much importance, that, to prevent any doubts as to its testimony, I shall add here some extracts from other parts of the work in which it occurs, showing the views inculcated *in that work itself*, on the doctrine of regeneration.† And we shall thereby see that Archbishop Laurence, when quoting the Service which seemed to him to favor his views, cannot have made himself acquainted with the doctrine maintained even in the context of what he quotes.

"We cannot enter into the kingdom of God except we be *born again*. (John iii.) And this *regeneration* consisteth not in mortal seed, but in immortal seed, and everlasting, that is to say, in the word of God, who liveth and abideth for ever as Peter witnesseth. . . . Seeing then the beginning, the middle, and the end of our new life, that is to say our regeneration into the said life, the increase of it and victory against Satan, standeth in God's words, the feeders of congregations may easily see, into what danger of God's wrath they run, *if any be*

* Various other passages might be pointed out showing the way in which our Baptismal Service has been borrowed from the Cologne. Thus, for instance, the prayer, "Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give thee humble thanks," &c. occurs *verbatim* in the Cologne Liturgy. And these coincidences show that what is similar to the Form of Luther in our Liturgy was derived to us *through* the Cologne Liturgy.

† The English is from the English edition of 1548 above mentioned, with the spelling modernized; and references are given to the Latin edition of Bonne in 1545.

not partakers of this regeneration through their negligence. . ...Wherefore they that have this office must ever with all diligence continue in reading, doctrine, prayer, and other exercises spiritual." (fol. 14.)

"For by reason of original sin all men are born under the wrath of God, and tyranny of the devil. Wherefore if God, to show us his just judgment, leave the children of the ungodly in the power of Satan, and therefore through their own mischievous acts bring upon themselves so horrible punishments, that the very world perceiveth the ungodliness of the parents to be punished in the children also, yet no wrong is done to those children, neither is God to be accused of iniquity, seeing that they be evil, and the children of wrath by nature, to whom God can owe nothing but everlasting punishment. So if God through his unspeakable mercy in Christ Jesu, deliver through his Son the children of them that loved him, from all perdition, whereunto they were born, and adorn them with excellent godliness through the gift of his Spirit, and so heap so many benefits upon them, that every godly man may easily judge that in them both their own and their parents' godliness is recompensed, and that it is declared, how dear they were to God; the unmeasurable goodness of God ought to be embraced, and magnified therein, and therefore God is more to be loved, and his word to be received more desirously, but the unsearchable judgments of his mercy ought not to be sought out, the deep bottom of his goodness must not be pored into, much less ought we to blame this his so great bounteousness, who doeth with his own as pleaseth him." (fol. 22, 23.)

"The visible Church of God in this life, is a company of persons truly believing the word of God delivered unto us by Christ and the Apostles, and of persons born again through the Holy Ghost. *In which company many abide in this life* NOT BORN AGAIN, having sins against their conscience, and yet consenting in doctrine and true use of the Sacraments. As in Paul's time there were at Corinth, and in other places among Christians, both godly men having the Holy Ghost, and also some that sinned against their conscience, which nevertheless spake not against the true doctrine and right use of the Sacraments, but took them with other in the congregation. And it is received by custom, that the godly be called the quick members of the Church, and the ungodly the Church's dead members." (fol. 101.)

This last passage was particularly objected to by the divines of Cologne in their "Antididagma,"* published in answer to the

* Antididagma, seu Christianæ et Catholicæ Religionis per Rev. et Illustr. dominos Canonicos Metropolitanæ Ecclesiæ Colon. propugnatio, adversus librum quendam universis Ordinibus seu Statibus Diœcesis ejus-

work from which I have been quoting. And the reply of Bucer (given in his "Defensio,"*) to the objection, is so clear and decisive a proof of his views, and otherwise so valuable, that I shall here add it.

"First of all they oppose the description of the Church laid down in the 'Book of Reformation,' namely, that the visible Church of God is an assembly of those who truly believe the word of God delivered to us by Christ and his Apostles, and are regenerated by the Holy Spirit: in which assembly many remain in this life *not born again*, having sins against their conscience," &c.

"The Adversaries find fault with this description, first in that they say, that it includes only the living members of the Church; nay that it is more properly a description of that invisible Church.

"The answer.

"That description which is given in the Book is taken *verbatim* from the Holy Scriptures; and therefore cannot be blamed by any one. For the Holy Spirit says, 'that the true Church is the Body of Christ,' that is, 'the congregation of those who live in Christ, and Christ in them, of whom he is the Head, and they his living members, flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones.' Ephes. 4 & 5. But ONLY THOSE THAT ARE BORN AGAIN ARE SUCH. And the Lord refers to this Church only when he says, Matth. 16, 'Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' But certainly whoever are *not born again*, over them the gates of hell yet rule. This Church is the only flock of Christ, and the congregation of those sheep of Christ, 'which know him and his voice, and follow him,' John 10. And what need is there to quote many passages of Scripture? Since we confess in the Apostles' Creed, which is the compendium and sum of Scripture, 'that we believe the Holy Church,' that is, 'the congregation and communion of saints.' 'But no one is holy, but he who lives in Christ, and is sanctified by his Spirit. But they who are not regenerate, such have not the Spirit of Christ, and are not Christ's.' Rom. 8. Wherefore neither are they of the Church and Body of Christ, although in this life they are mingled with the faithful in external communion of doctrine and the sacraments, as chaff with the wheat.

---

dem nuper Bonnæ titulo Reformationis exhibitum, ac postea (mutatis quibusdam) Consultoriæ deliberationis nomine impressum, &c. Colon. 1544. fol.

* Constans Defensio ex S. Scriptura et vera Catholica doctrina atque observatione Universalis Christianæ Ecclesiæ Deliberationis de Christiana Reformatione, quam Rev. &c. Hermannus Archiep. Colon. &c. jam ante publicavit. Auctore D. Martino Bucero. Nunc primum e MS. Buceri in lucem editus. Genev. 1613. 4to.

"The definition of the Church taken from the Holy Scriptures.

* * * * * * *

"From these and all the other passages of Scripture respecting the Church of Christ, any Christian man may clearly perceive, that Holy Scripture gives the title of the true Church of Christ to nothing else than the *congregation of those that are born again: with whom nevertheless, in this life, by external communion and communication, are mingled also those that are* NOT BORN AGAIN.

"This Church is also a visible Church: for since it is the congregation of the faithful, and the faithful may easily be discerned, as those who still live in this world, although they are not of this world, it follows, that this Church may be seen and easily known, namely by its fruits, to wit, the true confession of Christ and communication with all the members of Christ in the word the sacraments and discipline.

"'The world truly knows them not, since neither did it know God,' 1 John 3. Nor can the faithful behold any one's heart. 'For man sees those things that are without,' says Samuel, 'but God beholds the heart,' 1 Sam. xvi. Further, Christians ought not to judge any one rashly and before the time, until the time when 'the Lord shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness and make manifest the counsels of the hearts.' 1 Cor. iv. Yet nevertheless Christians can so recognize each other by the fruits of faith, as to know where to find the Church of Christ, and with whom they ought to keep up Christian communication, and with whom they ought not. 'Good and bad works are partly manifest beforehand, partly are made known by the judgment, and cannot be hid.' 1 Tim. v. Wherefore when the Book describes the Church to be the congregation of those who truly believe God, it describes not the invisible but the visible Church of Christ. Therefore the objection of the adversaries is only an empty calumny.

"Further, under that description are comprehended not only the living, as the adversaries cavil, but also the dead members, which are yet mingled in external communion with the living. For it is expressly laid down: 'In which assembly many remain in this life *not born again*, having sins against their conscience.' But just as Holy Scripture, so also this description of the Book of Reformation comprehends members of the Church of both kinds, and that in terms that make a distinction between them, according as also they differ, as far as possible, from one another. *For those alone that are born again are the true sons of God, the true flock and congregation of Christ*, as has been proved from Holy Scripture. But since also *those not born again are in external communion with those that are born again, by a false show before men, by the word, the sacraments and discipline*, therefore the Book added, 'In which assembly many remain that are *not born again*.'

"But as to what the Adversaries object,—'That these words are contrary to those that precede them, for if the Church is the congregation of those only who truly believe the word of God, and are regenerated, how can many be and remain in that same congregation who are *not regenerated*—again the Adversaries do not deal faithfully. For the Book of Reformation has not the word *(only)*, but that is added by themselves. And even if it had added this word, yet it would not have laid down or uttered anything contradictory. For these two speeches, that the true Church and Body of Christ is the congregation only of those born again and the living members of Christ, and that nevertheless there remain in that assembly those that are not born again, are quite reconcileable with each other: since it is evident, that Scripture uses this phrase (to be and remain in the Church) in two senses: one of which is according to the judgment of man, the other according to the judgment of God."

And after quoting some Scriptural proofs, he adds,—

"In the same way the Lord says also, John 15, 'Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away.' Likewise, 'He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit. If any man abide not in me, he is cast forth, &c.' By which words the Lord shows a double mode of remaining in him. One, by which the man always brings forth fruit: such are born again in the Lord. The other, by which a man brings forth no fruit at all, which is, to be in the Lord only apparently and before men, not in truth and before God.

"From all these things it is clear, that the true Church of Christ is the congregation of those only that are born again. For they who are not regenerate, such are not Christ's, and therefore are not of his Church. Yet nevertheless, before men, and so far as relates to the external co-participation of the Church, the profession of Christ *and the use of the Sacraments*, there are and remain among that body of persons born again some also that are *not regenerate*.

* * * * * * *

"The blessed Apostle Paul, when he commended the Churches to the Ephesian elders, although he well knew, that it might be that among them some that were not born again might lie concealed, yet nevertheless he applies the word 'Church' strictly to those alone that were born again, when he says, 'Give heed therefore to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.'

"He treats the matter also in a similar way, when he writes to

Timothy, and enjoins upon him the right performance and administration of the Episcopal office in the Church. 'These things I write to thee,' he says, 'hoping to come unto thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.'

"But certainly to be purchased with the blood of Christ, to be the flock and house of God, the pillar and ground of the truth, *that belongs properly to the regenerate alone.*"*

---

* "Primum omnium oppugnant descriptionem Ecclesiæ propositam in Libro Reformationis, nempe quod visibilis Ecclesia Dei sit congregatio illorum, qui verbum Dei nobis per Christum et Apostolos commendatum veraciter credunt, et per Spiritum S. sunt regenerati: in quo cœtu multi manent in hac vita *non renati*, habentes peccata contra conscientiam," &c.

"Hanc descriptionem reprehendunt Adversarii primùm in eo quòd dicunt, illam viva tantùm Ecclesiæ membra complecti: imo veriùs esse descriptionem invisibilis illius Ecclesiæ.

"Responsio.

"Descriptio illa quæ habetur in Libro est ex S. Scripturis ad verbum desumpta, quare a nemine vituperari potest. Etenim Spiritus S. dicit, 'veram Ecclesiam Dei esse Corpus Christi,' hoc est, 'congregationem illorum qui in Christo vivunt, et Christus in ipsis, quorum ipse caput est, illi verò viva ejus membra, caro de carne ejus, et os de ossibus ejus.' Ephes. 4 et 5. *Tales vero sunt* SOLI RENATI. Et hanc tantùm Ecclesiam intelligit Dominus cum inquit, Matth. 16: 'Super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferorum non prævalebunt illi.' Jam vero quicumque *renati non sunt*, illis dominantur adhuc portæ inferorum. Hæc Ecclesia est unicus grex Christi et congregatio illarum ovium Christi, 'quæ ipsum et vocem ejus agnoscunt, eumque sequuntur.' Joan. 10. Et quid opus est multarum Scripturarum citatione? Cùm fateamur in symbolo Apostolico, quod compendium est et summa Scripturæ, 'nos credere sanctam Ecclesiam,' hoc est, 'congregationem et communionem sanctorum.' 'Nemo autem sanctus est, nisi qui vivit in Christo, et per Spiritum ejus sanctificatus est. Qui verò regenerati non sunt, ii Spiritum Christi non habent et non sunt Christi.' Rom. 8. Quare neque sunt de Ecclesia et corpore Christi, etiamsi in externam communionem doctrinæ et sacramentorum fidelibus sint in hac vita admixti, quemadmodum paleæ tritico.

"*Definitio Ecclesiæ sumpta ex S. Literis.*"

* * * * * * * *

"Ex his et omnibus aliis Scripturis de Ecclesia Christi, quivis Christianus liquidò cognoscere potest, S. Scripturam nihil aliud vocare veram Ecclesiam Christi, quam *congregationem renatorum: quibus tamen in hac vita per externam conversionem* [? conversationem] *et communicationem admixti sunt etiam* NON RENATI.

"Hæc Ecclesia est etiam visibilis Ecclesia: cum enim sit congregatio fidelium, fideles autem facile cerni possint, ut qui adhuc in hoc mundo vivunt, etiamsi de mundo non sint, consequitur, hanc Ecclesiam videri facilèque agnosci posse, nempe ex fructibus ejus, vera videlicet confessione Christi, et communicatione cum omnibus membris Christi in verbo Sacramentis et disciplina.

"'Mundus quidem non novit illos, siquidem nec Deum novit.' 1 Joan. 3. Nec possunt fideles cujusquam cor intueri. 'Homo etenim videt ea quæ foris sunt,' inquit Samuel, 'Deus autem inspicit cor.' 1 Sam. 16. Adhæc

These passages, then, clearly show, that Bucer was far enough from intending to imply, by his expressions in the Cologne Liturgy, that regeneration always takes place in infants at their baptism.

Nevertheless, considering the true nature and purpose of this

---

non debent Christiani quemquam temere et ante tempus judicare, quoad usque 'Dominus abscondita tenebrarum illuminabit, et manifestabit consilia cordium.' 1 Cor. 4. Nihilominus tamen possunt Christiani se invicem ex fructibus fidei adeò cognoscere, ut sciant ubi Ecclesiam Christi invenire, et cum quibus communicationem Christi servare debeant, cum quibus verò non item. 'Bona et mala opera partim antea manifesta, partim per judicium cognoscuntur, et occultari non possunt.' 1 Timoth. 5. Quapropter cum Ecclesiam Liber describat esse congregationem vere credentium Deo, non invisibilem sed visibilem Ecclesiam Christi describit. Est igitur Adversariorum objectio nihil aliud nisi inanis calumnia.

"Adhæc sub illa descriptione non viva tantùm, ut Adversarii cavillantur, sed etiam mortua membra, quæ vivis adhuc in externa communicatione admixti sunt, comprehenduntur. Expressè enim positum est: In quo cœtu multi manent in hac vita *non renati*, habentes peccata contra conscientiam. Sed quemadmodum S. Scriptura, ita etiam hæc Libri Reformationis descriptio utriusque generis membra Ecclesiæ comprehendit, idque distincte, sicut etiam maximo a se invicem discrimine distant. *Soli enim renati sunt veri filii Dei, verus grex Christi et congregatio*, quemadmodum ex S. Scriptura probatum est. Quare ponitur in Libro, *Ecclesiam Dei cœtum renatorum*. Quoniam verò etiam *non renati falsa coram hominibus specie cum renatis externe communicant, in verbo, Sacramentis, et disciplina*, ideo Liber apposuit, In quo cœtu multi manent *non renati*.

"Quod vero Adversarii objiciunt: Hæc verba præcedentibus esse contraria, si enim Ecclesia sit congregatio illorum tantùm qui verbo Dei veracitèr credunt, suntque regenerati, quomodo possunt in eadem illa congregatione esse et manere plurimi, qui *non sunt regenerati*,—rursus non fidelitèr agunt Adversarii. Liber enim Reformationis vocabulum (tantùm) non habet, sed ab ipsis appositum est. Et quamvis etiam hanc vocem addidisset, nihil tamen posuisset aut dixisset contrarium. Nam hæ duæ locutiones, quòd vera Ecclesia et corpus Christi sit congregatio tantùm renatorum et vivorum membrorum Christi, et quòd nihilominus in isto cœtu maneant, qui *regenerati non sunt*, juxta se invicem optimè consistere possunt: quandoquidem constat, Scripturam hunc loquendi modum (In Ecclesia esse et manere) duplici sensu usurpare: quorum alter est secundum judicium humanum, alter secundum judicium Dei."

* * * * * * * *

"Eodem modo dicit Dominus etiam Joan. 15. 'Omnem palmitem in me non ferentem fructum tollit.' Item, 'Qui manserit in me, et ego in eo, hic fert fructum multum. Si quis in me non manserit, ejectus est foras,' &c. Quibus verbis Dominus geminam manendi in se rationem ostendit. Unam, per quam homo perpetuò fert fructum: tales sunt renati in Domino. Alteram, qua homo nullos omnino fructus profert, quod est tantùm in speciem, et coram hominibus in Domino esse, non in veritate et coram Deo.

"Ex his hominibus [omnibus] perspicuum est, veram Ecclesiam Christi esse congregationem tantùm renatorum. Nam qui regenerati non sunt, ii non sunt Christi, atque idcirco neque de Ecclesia ejus. Nihilominus tamen sunt et manent inter istos renatos coram hominibus, et quantum

rite, as it operates in the true children of God, he in the same work uses such language as the following.

"It must needs be that they plainly know not the gospel of Christ, and communion of saints. . . . whosoever they be that will not have our infants to be purged from sins with the Sacrament of Regeneration, and to be planted in the Church of God, seeing that it behoved infants of the old people to be sanctified, and planted into the body of Christ which is the Church, with that Sacrament that God then gave them for this purpose. For why should our infants pertain less to the kingdom of God than theirs, seeing that through Christ we be grafted in the holy root of that people, and made partakers of the blessed fatness of this olive. (Rom. xi.) Furthermore we have given unto us a mightier spirit. (Rom. viii.) But we be gotten in sins, as well as the Jews, and have need to be delivered from sins through Christ, and so be brought unto the life of God, and that in Christ's Church. For there is not salvation without the Church, where neither the Word nor Sacrament is. Infants then must be planted into the Church, and we must give them the sign that witnesseth that the promise pertaineth unto them. And forasmuch as in this time the Gospel, the grace of God, and redemption of Christ be more clearly and effectuously exhibited and preached in the Church both with words and Sacraments, than among the old people, every man surely being rightly warned hereof, except he be a very ungodly person, shall acknowledge that our infants also must be washed from sins by baptism, which is the Sacrament of Regeneration, and that they must be planted in Christ our Lord, in his Church, in which Church Christ worketh through his Word and Sacraments, as Paul saith that Christ loved the congregation, and gave himself for it, to sanctify it, and

---

ad externam Ecclesiæ communicationem pertinet, *professionis Christi, et usus Sacramentorum*, etiam *non regenerati*.

* * * * * * * *

"Beatus Apostolus Paulus, cùm presbyteris Ephesinis Ecclesias commendabat, quamvis probe sciret, fieri posse ut in eis nonnulli etiam non renati laterent, nihilominus tamen Ecclesiæ vocabulum ad solos renatos propriè refert, cùm inquit, 'Attendite igitur vobis et cuncto gregi, in quo vos Sp. S. posuit Episcopos ad regendam Ecclesiam Dei, quam acsivit [acquisivit] sanguine suo.'

"Ad eundem modum facit etiam, cùm ad Timotheum scribit, eique munus Episcopale ritè in Ecclesia obeundum et administrandum imponit. 'Hæc scribo tibi,' inquit, 'sperans fore ut veniam ad te citò. Quod si tardius venero, ut noris quomodo oporteat in domo Dei versari, quæ est Ecclesia Dei viventis, columna et stabilimentum veritatis.'

"Jam verò per sanguinem Christi acquisitum esse, gregem et domum Dei esse, columnam et stabilimentum veritatis, id *regeneratis tantùm propriè convenit.*" (Bucceri Constans Defensio, &c. pp. 105—109. See also pp. 110—112.)

cleanse it, with the laver of water, &c. He describeth not the congregation without signs, and without the word. Wherefore he saith also in another place, One body, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. Which things surely do testify, that *they which pertain to the congregation*, be planted into the same with some outward sign also."* (fol. 145.—*Lat.* fol. 65.)

"Baptism is a Sacrament of Regeneration, whereby we be planted and incorporated into Christ the Lord, and be buried into his death, and put on the same, and be made through him the sons and heirs of God." (fol. 153.—*Lat.* fol. 68.)

But it is *through faith* that the Sacraments are held to be thus efficacious.

"They [the Anabaptists] withdraw [*i. e.* detract, "detrahunt Sacramentis"] from the Sacraments, which they will to be nothing else, than outward signs of our profession and fellowship, as the badges of Captains be in war, they deny that they be works and ceremonies instituted of God for this purpose, that in them we should acknowledge, embrace, and receive *through faith* the mercy of God, and the merit and communion of Christ, and that God worketh by these signs, and exhibiteth unto us [*it should be*, unto believers] the gifts in deed, which he offereth with these signs."† (fol. 142.—*Lat.* fol. 64.)

And the views under the influence of which the Baptismal and other Services in this Cologne Liturgy were drawn up as they are, seem to me plain from other parts of the work, especially from the remarks on the subject "Of Christian Prayer."

"This," it is said, "is to pray truly in the name of Christ, neither can it be but that we shall be heard, as often as we pray with such a mind and such a sure confidence, as John witnesseth. (1 John v.) This is the trust that we have towards God, that if we shall ask a thing according to his will, he heareth us, &c. Therefore the preachers shall declare to the people diligently, *what a great sin doubting in prayer is*.‡ For seeing that our prayer hath the promise of God laid before it, it followeth, that he which doubteth, whether he be heard or no, doubteth also whether God be true, whether he perform the thing that he promiseth. And there can be no greater shame done to God, than if we doubt whether he be true. And therefore the prayer of a

* Quæ certe testantur, hos qui ad Ecclesiam pertinent, signo etiam aliquo externo Ecclesiæ insertos esse.

† Deum per hæc in animis nostris operari, et ea quæ his signis dona offert, etiam re ipsa præstare *credentibus*.

‡ Quantum peccatum sit in oratione dubitatio.

man that doubteth can obtain nothing, as James teacheth. He that doubteth is like the waves of the sea, which be tossed with the winds. Let not a doubting man think, that he shall receive anything of the Lord." (fol. 109, 110.—*Lat.* fol. 48, 49.)

And hence we see the meaning of those words in the Baptismal Service, which have been transferred almost *verbatim* to our own, where the minister, addressing "the parents, godfathers, and kinsfolk," says,—

"Ye have renounced Satan and the world, ye have confessed the faith of Christ, and ye have promised obedience to Christ, and the congregation, and ye have required of God the Father, that for his Son's sake, our Lord Jesus Christ, he will deliver these infants from the kingdom of darkness, and settle them in the kingdom of his beloved Son. You must remember these things, and *doubt nothing but that we shall receive all these things that we require, if we believe.* Therefore lifting up your minds unto the Lord, appear ye here with all religion, as in the sight of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and receive ye with *sure faith* AND THANKSGIVING *the benefit of regeneration and adoption into everlasting life*, of the one God himself, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. And because the Lord himself commanded us to baptize, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, undoubtedly God himself baptizeth our infants, cleanseth them from sins, *delivereth them from everlasting death*, putteth upon them his own righteousness, and *giveth them life eternal.* We must acknowledge with true faith, and ever magnify these exceeding benefits of God." (fol. 165.—*Lat.* fol. 74.)

The words which I have put in italics in the latter part of this passage, are *necessarily* only the language of charitable hope, and such therefore is the meaning of the context. I need hardly remind the reader of the similar language in our own Service. "*Doubt ye not* therefore, but *earnestly believe*, that he will likewise favourably receive this present infant, that he will embrace him with the arms of his mercy, that he will *give unto him the blessing of eternal life*, and make him *partaker of his everlasting kingdom.*" Here is an "earnest belief" inculcated of that of which we can only have, *as it respects the mass*, a charitable hope.

And so thoroughly is this view carried out in the Cologne Service, that a *declaration* is required from the Godparents that

they *do* believe what this exhortation commends to their belief. For one of the questions put to them is this :—

"Out of this confession [*i. e.* the Creed] do you believe that the Holy Ghost will be your Teacher and Comforter, and the Teacher and Comforter of this child, and that you be the *true* members [vera membra] of the body of Christ our Lord, and of his Church, and that this child by baptism shall be a true member of Christ, and his Church, wherein he shall have remission of sins, a sure hope of resurrection, and [of] life everlasting? Answ. We believe." (fol. 162.—*Lat.* fol. 72, 73.)

And so, again, in the Exhortation it is said,—

"Therefore through baptism we determine certainly, that we are acceptable unto God and joined unto him with *an everlasting covenant of grace, so that nothing can separate us from him or condemn us.*"* (fol. 159.—*Lat.* fol. 71.)

These words, of course, cannot apply to all that are baptized.

And in another part of the Service there is added a prayer that the parties that present the child may be *enabled to exercise this spirit of faith and thanksgiving* as to the spiritual benefit conferred upon the child (a prayer which, if regeneration is conferred necessarily, or *ex opere operato*, would be most improper,) in these words,—

"Grant us also that after Baptism we may acknowledge them for thy children, and members of the body of thy Son, that we may godly bring them up in the fear of thee unto thy glory," &c. (fol. 166.—*Lat.* fol. 75.)

We may here see, then, some of the reasons which induced Bucer, notwithstanding the view he held as to the doctrine of election, to adopt the language he has used in his Baptismal Service. While he held that God worked according to his own will, he also held that secret things belong unto God, but those that are revealed to us; and therefore that we are bound to put our faith in the promises of God, and act in the belief that the prayer of faith will be heard. And it is the want of a realizing apprehen-

* "Itaque ex baptismate certo statuimus, nos Deo acceptos, et fœdere gratiæ sempiterno ei conjunctos esse, *adeo ut nihil ab ipso sejungere et damnare possit.*" It will be observed, that the *former* part of this sentence was quoted by Archbishop Laurence, but the *latter* part (which carries the meaning too far to accord with the Archbishop's views) *omitted.*

sion of the view of Divine truth to which such doctrine tends, that leads theologians of a different school into misapprehensions as to the real meaning of the expressions of such men as Bucer, and frequently to complaints of the ambiguity and self-contrariety of their statements; as for instance, Archbishop Laurence, in the work I have just quoted, complains of Calvin, that "no man perhaps was ever less scrupulous in the adoption of *general expressions*, but perhaps no man adopted them with more *mental reservations*, than Calvin," (p. 375); an observation which he seems to think particularly applicable to his remarks respecting baptism. (See pp. 263—265.) Had he read more of Bucer, he would have found (as we have seen) precisely the same course adopted, and *as the Scriptural one*.

It appears however to me to have been held by Bucer, that, in the case of the elect, the act of baptism is the formal act of incorporation into the true mystical body of Christ, and that consequently a spiritual regeneration may be truly said to take place in it in such cases. It is also clear, however, that he (like others) sometimes uses this word, regeneration, with reference *solely* to an inward change or renovation of the mind and affections.

The testimony of this Cologne Liturgy, then, is really conclusive of itself against the supposition that our Baptismal Service is (to say the least) not *open* to the hypothetical system of interpretation. I put the argument in its lowest form, as sufficient for my present purpose. But I think that any impartial reader will have no hesitation in pronouncing, that the case of the Cologne Liturgy proves much more than this; that it, in fact, demonstrates, that the hypothetical sense was that intended to be affixed to our Baptismal Office by those who drew it up.

Whether it was the most judicious course to pursue, and whether all the reasons that seem to have influenced the minds of the Reformers in adopting the phraseology used in this Service are valid,—are questions which I do not feel it to be necessary to discuss. My present object is to point out *the facts* of the case.

CHAPTER X.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATECHISM ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

The same theological system which we have hitherto found to pervade the works, both public and private, of our early divines, is, of course, observable in the Catechism they drew up for children. And the discrepancy between their theology and that of the larger and (politically considered) more influential portion of their successors after the lapse of about half a century, that has caused their Liturgical Services to be misconstrued, has, of course, had the same effect in the case of the Catechism. The argument as to the meaning is in both cases one and the same. And the proofs stand or fall together.

Certain *words*, disconnected from the known sentiments of the men to whom we are indebted for them, are appealed to as conclusive in favour of the "High Church" doctrine on the subject. The argument is in fact very similar to that of the Roman Catholics for the doctrine of transubstantiation from the words "This is my body."

It is only necessary, however, to go to the works of our early divines, and make ourselves acquainted with their general theological views, to see that such an interpretation is entirely contrary to their doctrine. The phraseology of the Catechism is precisely in accordance with that used in the Baptismal Offices, the meaning of which we have already seen.

As in the Baptismal Service we are led to the expression of our presumptive belief that the child baptized is accepted by God, so in the Catechism, the child, not yet arrived at the years

of responsibility, is taught to use respecting itself the language appropriate to one who has been so accepted. No one really conversant with the views and phraseology of our early divines would expect any other language to be put into the mouth of the child. Hence the child, speaking of its baptism, is taught to say,—"Wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven."

But immediately the current theology among our divines began to change, and not till then, these words were fixed upon as containing an affirmation that every child necessarily received at its baptism the full baptismal blessing of spiritual regeneration and incorporation into the true Church of Christ.

These words are insisted upon as a dogmatical declaration of the Church as to her views on the effects of Infant Baptism.

I shall now proceed, therefore, to consider the meaning of these words, as shown both by other parts of the Catechism and by contemporary writings. My remarks are principally directed to this passage, because it alone affords any *plausible* ground for saying that the Catechism is opposed to the view I am here maintaining of the doctrine of our Church. The quotations sometimes made from the latter part of the Catechism, (which was added after the Hampton Court Conference, and which, though put in its present form by Overall, is chiefly taken from Nowell's smallest Catechism,) are entirely and obviously misapplied. The description there given of the nature of a Sacrament, as consisting properly of two parts, applies as much to the case of adults as to that of infants; and therefore, as in the case of adults both Sacraments may be administered without being accompanied by the grace of the Sacrament, so no evidence can be adduced from the nature of the Sacrament of Baptism as consisting properly of two parts, to prove that all infants must necessarily have received both parts in their baptism. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper consists of two parts, but "the wicked" (our Article tells us) "are in no wise partakers of Christ" in receiving it, but only "eat and drink *the sign or Sacrament* of so great a thing." And so, though baptism has properly two parts, and one is spiritual regenerating grace, an infant may receive it and yet receive only *the sign or sacrament* of that grace. A conclusive argument, no doubt, may be derived

from these passages against those who affirm that the Sacrament of Baptism is a bare and empty sign, to which, even in the case of the worthy recipient, no special grace is attached by Divine promise. But the question as to the character and qualifications necessary in those who receive the inward grace as well as the outward sign in baptism, both as it respects adults and infants, is not touched by the statements here made as to the nature and effects of baptism.

The only passage, then, calling for explanation, is the one I have already quoted :—"Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." And from this passage is deduced the doctrine that every child is in baptism spiritually regenerated; born again by a new and spiritual birth, such as cannot be repeated, and which makes a man a spiritually regenerate man for the rest of his life. Whatever a man's conduct may be, if he was baptized in his infancy, he *is* a regenerate man. There may never be from first to last any faith or repentance exercised by him. But nevertheless, if he has been baptized as an infant, all this must be predicated of him to the end of his life. Such is the doctrine maintained.

Now the best proof of the sense in which these words were used, is to be derived from other works of the same period. But I must first observe, that the Catechism itself supplies us with amply sufficient evidence against such an interpretation of the words as that just mentioned. I will not now dwell upon the general character of the replies put, throughout, into the mouth of the child, as appropriate only to one whose mind is in the condition in which we could desire it to be; though this fact ought to be carefully observed. For instance, when the question is asked, "Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe and do as thy godfathers and godmothers promised for thee at thy baptism," the reply is, "*Yes, verily,* and by God's help so I will," &c.; words which it would be absurd to take as *affirmatory* of the *state of mind* of every child, and the proper subjects (as the Bishop of Exeter and others would make the Catechism) of *dogmatical inferences.**

* From such passages as this, the Bishop of Exeter may see the absurdities into which his notion of "the precise dogmatic teaching" of the Catechism (see his Charge, p. 46) would lead those who followed it out.

But there are two passages in the Catechism which afford conclusive evidence on the subject.

The first occurs in the former part of it, and was in the Catechism as originally published, and shows clearly both the doctrinal views, and the principle, upon which the Catechism is constructed. In speaking of the Holy Ghost, the Catechumen is instructed to say, "who sanctifieth *me* and all *the elect* people of God;" words which evidently and directly teach him to regard himself as one of "the elect people of God." And who "the elect people of God" were, in the view of our Reformers and early divines, can hardly be a question with any one who will take the trouble to consult their writings. And I have already given so many proofs on this point, that I think it needless to add to them here. But as these words, understood in such a sense, obviously supply us with an irresistible argument in favour of the view for which I am here contending, I would direct the reader's attention to two contemporary documents of public authority of a similar kind, which settle the question beyond dispute.

The first is the Catechism published by Cranmer himself in 1553, called Edward VI. Catechism, as having been issued by his authority. To the question respecting the Holy Spirit, "Cur Sanctus appellatur," the reply is, "Non tantùm ob suam ipsius sanctitatem, sed quòd per eum *electi Dei et membra Christi* sancta efficiantur." Or as it is expressed in the English edition;—"Not only for his own holiness; but for that by him are made holy *the chosen of God and members of Christ*."* Now in this Catechism, as we have already seen,† the "electi Dei," or "chosen of God," are those members of the visible church that are "stedfast in the faith," and "predestinate and appointed out to everlasting life before the world was made," through the gratuitous "goodness and love of God." And this Catechism was, as I have said, published by Cranmer himself nearly at the same time that he gave the Church the little one we are now considering.

The second document is Nowell's Catechism, publicly sanctioned by our Church at the time at which our Prayer Book was

---

* Liturgies of Edward VI., Park. Soc. ed. pp. 562 and 514.

† See pp. 72, 73, above.

re-established at the commencement of Queen Elizabeth's reign. The same words that I have just quoted from Edward VI. Catechism are repeated in this.* And after the proofs given above of the connexion between this Catechism and that of Calvin,† it would be mere trifling to discuss the question, who he meant by the elect or chosen of God.

The answer put into the mouth of the child, then, as to the effects of Baptism, is at once explained. The child who was taught to consider himself one of "the elect people of God," was also taught that, being such, he had (according to the theology of that period) received in baptism the full baptismal blessing. Whatever other sense the words of the Catechism may in themselves be capable of receiving, (and I have no wish to limit them to the "Calvinistic" view) this was certainly the sense in which they were originally understood. And this original meaning it is necessary to bear in mind, if we would take an intelligent view of the case as it really is. Even taking the words in what would now be called the "Arminian" sense, (that is, that the election spoken of is the result of foreseen faith and holiness,) one thing would still be clear, that the language put into the mouth of the child must be understood as applicable, not to every member of the visible Church without distinction, but only to a certain portion of it. And so clearly did Archbishop Laurence see this, that (to make good his ground) he adopted the monstrous position, that *all* the members of the visible Church are regarded by our Church as *the elect*. Such a notion does not deserve a serious refutation.

In fact, apart from any question of the meaning of the word "elect," the phrase, "who *sanctifieth* me," shows that the words must not be understood as descriptive of the condition of *all*. For, are *all* thus sanctified?

Again, a passage in the latter part of the Catechism (which though added at a later period, must be taken now in connexion with the former) directly opposes the notion that the full baptismal blessing is necessarily conferred upon all infants. For not only is it said that "repentance and faith" are necessary in an adult coming to baptism, in order that he may profit by it,

* See ed. of Oxf. 1795. 8vo. p. 94. † See pp. 88—90 above.

but in answer to the question, "Why then are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them," the reply is,—"*Because* they promise them both by their sureties, which promise when they come to age themselves are bound to perform." Now I have already said, that these words are not to be taken as meaning, that baptism is not *valid* unless these promises are made. But the requirement of these promises by our Church shows her sense of the *nature* of the Sacrament of Baptism even in the case of infants; namely, that it is a federal act involving *conditions* to be fulfilled in the state of the child before it realizes the full blessing of the Covenant. But suppose the state of the child neither is, nor ever should be, such as to correspond with what is promised for it. Are we to presume to say, that the full blessing of the covenant is nevertheless given? Here, then, at once, is a limitation to the "wholesome effect" of baptism in infants. Without touching upon the case of those who die in infancy, which is peculiar, the case of those who live to grow up, clearly comes under this condition. And when the Catechism lays it down as necessary, that repentance and faith should be promised for the child, it is clear that such repentance and faith are considered as having some connexion with the baptismal blessing; and therefore that that blessing is not necessarily, and as a matter of course, bestowed upon every infant baptized.

It is obvious that if the view of our opponents had been that of the Church, the answer to the question,—"Why, then, are infants baptized, &c.?"—would have been,—Because all infants are without exception worthy recipients, and receive necessarily, as not being able to place any impediment in the way, the full baptismal blessing. But as I have already noticed this point in the preceding chapter, I will not enlarge further upon it.

But, perhaps, the most conclusive proof of the principle on which the Catechism is drawn up, may be derived from the language of other works of and near the same period; and I would first point the reader's attention to the language *even* of the "Institution of a Christian Man," published in 1537, as shown in the following extracts. I do not of course quote this work as any authority for the doctrines of our Protestant Church, but

there is an *a fortiori* argument derivable from it in such questions as that now before us, which is certainly of considerable weight.

"I believe also and profess, that he is my very God, my Lord, and my Father, and that I am his servant and his own son, *by adoption and grace*, and the right inheritor of his kingdom." (p. 31.)

"I believe also, and profess, that Jesu Christ is not only Jesus, and Lord to all men that believe in him, but also that he is my Jesus, my God, and my Lord. For whereas of my nature I was born in sin, and in the indignation and displeasure of God, and was the very child of wrath, &c. . . . . Jesu Christ, by suffering of most painful and shameful death upon the cross, &c. . . . hath now pacified his Father's indignation towards me, and hath reconciled me again into his favour, and that he hath loosed and delivered me from the yoke and tyranny of death, of the Devil, and of sin, *and hath made me so free from them, that they shall not finally hurt or annoy me*, and that he hath poured out plentifully his holy Spirit and his graces upon me, specially faith, to illumine and direct my reason and judgment, and charity, to direct my will and affections towards God. . . . Besides all this, he hath brought and delivered me from darkness and blindness to light, from death to life, and from sin to justice, and he hath taken me into his protection, and made me as his own peculiar possession, and he hath *planted and grafted me into his own body and made me a member of the same*, and he hath communicated and made me participant of his justice, his power, his life, his felicity, and of all his goods: so that now I may boldly say and believe, as indeed *I do perfectly believe*, that by his passion, his death, his blood, &c. . . . he hath made a sufficient expiation or propitiation towards God &c. . . . and that *I am so clearly rid from all the guilt of my said offences, and from the everlasting pain due for the same, that neither sin, nor death, nor hell, shall be able, or have any power, to hurt me or to let me, but that after this transitory life I shall ascend into heaven, there to reign with my Saviour Christ perpetually in glory and felicity.*" (pp. 34, 35.)

And the Catholic Church having been described as consisting of the true members of Christ and such as will finally be saved, it is added,—

"And I believe and trust assuredly, that *I am one of the members of this Catholic Church*, and that God of his only mercy hath not only chosen and called me thereunto by his Holy Spirit, and by *the efficacy of his word and Sacraments*, and hath inserted and united me into this universal body or flock, *and hath made me his son and inheritor of his kingdom*; but also that he shall of his like goodness,

and by the operation of the Holy Ghost, justify me here in this world, and finally glorify me in heaven." (pp. 56, 57.)

"It is also further to be noted and considered, that it is not only very necessary for all true Christian men to learn and know the certain notes and marks whereby the very true Church of Christ is discerned from the Church or congregation of the wicked, which God hateth, and also what is the principal cause whereby they be made to be the very quick members of the Church of Christ, but it is also one of the greatest comforts that any Christian man can have, *to believe and trust for certain*, that there is such a congregation, which containeth the very lively members of Christ's mystical body, *and that he is a member of the same congregation:* specially considering the great and excellent promises which Christ himself hath made unto the said congregation, being his own mystical body, and his own most dear and tenderly beloved spouse. And for these causes and considerations, and such other, it is (no doubt) to be thought, that this ninth Article was added and put into this Creed, specially and principally to describe and declare the Church, as it is taken in the said *second manner of signification*." (This second manner of signification being, when it is taken "for the Catholic congregation, or number of *them only* which be chosen, called, and ordained to reign with Christ in everlasting life," as distinguished from its other signification of "the whole congregation of them that be christened and profess Christ's gospel.") (pp. 77, 78.)

The view here taken, then, clearly was, that as it was the duty of every man to be a true believer, so (true faith being an appropriating faith, involving, it was supposed, a belief of personal acceptance and final salvation,) it was right that he should consider himself one of those "chosen, called, and ordained to reign with Christ in everlasting life." After this the language of the Catechism can hardly, it might be thought, offer any difficulty.

But, what is of still more importance, we find Nowell's Catechism (publicly approved by the Convocations of 1562 and 1571) directing the Catechumen to use language of the same kind respecting himself, where it obviously applies only to a portion of the members of the visible Church. Thus, in a passage already quoted, the catechumen is taught to say,—

"But they who are firm, stable, and persevering in this faith, these were elected, appointed, and (as we say) predestinated to this great felicity before the foundations of the world were laid: and of this they have the Spirit of Christ within in their souls as a witness, the author as well as the most assured pledge of this confidence. And by

the teaching of this Divine Spirit, I most certainly assure myself that I myself also, by the blessing of God through Christ, am freely made a citizen of this blessed city [i. e. the Church]."*

Hence, throughout, Nowell uses the word "us," ("nos,") to express those whom God had elected to salvation. "God loved and elected *us* in Christ before the foundations of the world were laid."† While, at the same time, speaking of the visible Church, he says, "Many hypocritically and by the simulation of piety join themselves to this society, who are as far as possible from being true members of the Church."‡

And in the part treating expressly on the subject of Baptism, the following words are used,—

"M. Explain then in a few words in what things the right use of baptism consists.

"A. In faith and repentance. For first *we ought to have our minds convinced with an unwavering confidence that we, being cleansed from all defilements by the blood of Christ, are acceptable to God, and that his Spirit dwells in us.*"§

While, nevertheless, in the question and answer immediately preceding, the reply to the question whether all the baptized receive the grace of baptism, is,—"The faithful only partake of this fruit."‖

And if we look to the private writings of our early divines, we shall see that this language of assured belief of being a true and living member of Christ's Church, was strongly insisted on as the proper language of every professed Christian, though in *strict*

---

* Qui autem sunt in hac fide firmi, stabiles atque constantes, hi electi atque designati et (ut nos loquimur) prædestinati erant ad hanc tantam felicitatem ante posita mundi fundamenta: cujus rei testem ipsi intus in animis habent Spiritum Christi, fiduciæ hujus authorem pariter et pignus certissimum. Cujus Divini Spiritus instinctu, *mihi etiam certissime persuadeo meipsum quoque* beata hac civitate, Dei per Christum beneficio, gratuito donatum esse. (See pp. 88, 89 above.)

† *Nos* Deus....ante mundi jacta fundamenta in Christo dilexit atque *elegit.* (See p. 91 above.)

‡ Multi per hypocrisin et simulationem pietatis, in hanc se societatem adjungunt, qui *nihil minus quam vera ecclesiæ membra sunt.* (See p. 89 above.)

§ M. Rectus ergo baptismi usus quibus in rebus sit situs, breviter edissere.

A. In fide et pœnitentia. Primum enim *Christi nos sanguine a cunctis purgatos sordibus Deo gratos esse, Spiritumque ejus in nobis habitare, certa fiducia cum animis nostris statutum habere oportet.* (See p. 257 above.)

‖ Soli fideles hunc fructum percipiunt. (See p. 257 above.)

fact applicable only to a portion of the members of the visible Church.

I have already pointed out how clearly this is manifested in the writings of the eminent martyr John Bradford.* I will not, therefore, repeat the extracts and remarks there given.

So also in the writings of Bishop Babington.† And I will add here one extract from him on this point to that already given. In his "Exposition of the Catholic Faith," he says,—

"True faith is not only a knowledge whereby I firmly assent unto all things which God in his word hath opened unto us, but also a sure trust raised up in my heart by the Holy Ghost through the Gospel, whereby I rest in God certainly persuaded, that remission of sins, eternal righteousness and life is given, not only to others, but also *to me*, and that freely of the mercy of God, for the merit of Christ only."‡

And, as we have seen, Rogers, in his Exposition of the Articles, publicly sanctioned by Archbishop Bancroft, lays it down as one of the errors of the Papists, that they teach, "that none are to think or persuade themselves that they are of the number of the predestinate unto salvation, but to be ever doubtful thereof."§

How strong, indeed, was the feeling on the subject of this doctrine, in Queen Elizabeth's time at least, may be judged of from the case of Barret at Cambridge in 1595, the particulars of which have been given above.‖ In a letter of Dr. Whitaker, the Regius Professor of Divinity, to Archbishop Whitgift, on this case, the learned Professor says,—

"That a true faithful Christian man ought to believe remission of his sins and his salvation; and that he is sure and certain thereof, by infallible testimony of the Holy Ghost, is the doctrine of the Scriptures, as your Grace knoweth right well: and is confirmed by the Fathers, and by sundry Schoolmen and Popish writers acknowledged."¶

And this doctrine was laid down in the sixth Lambeth Article.**

But this they believed to be the case only in "the elect;" and

---

* See pp. 231—238 above. † See p. 318 above.
‡ Works, 1622. fol. Expos. of Cath. Faith, p. 173. § See p. 101 above.
‖ See pp. 112 et seq. above.
¶ Strype's Whitgift, App. Bk. iv. No. xxv.; iii. 339.
** See p. 120 above.

that to them only baptism was efficacious.* Nevertheless, considering this language of assurance to be the proper and befitting language of professed Christians, they could not consistently have put into the mouth of a catechumen any other language than such as is found in the Catechism.

And this interpretation of the words of the Catechism is confirmed by a comparison of them with those of a Catechism notoriously drawn up on Calvinistic principles; namely, the Heidelberg Catechism.†

For in the Heidelberg Catechism, we find the catechumen instructed to say,—

"I believe that the Son of God doth, from the beginning of the world to the end, gather, defend, and preserve unto himself by his Spirit and word, out of whole mankind, a company chosen to everlasting life, and agreeing in true faith: and that *I am a lively member of that company, and so shall remain for ever.*"‡

And the spirit in which this answer is conceived runs through the Catechism. For instance:—

"Q. 52. What comfort hast thou by the coming again of Christ to judge the quick and the dead? Answ. That in all my miseries and persecutions, I look with my head lifted up for the very same who before yielded himself unto the judgment of God for me and took away all malediction from me, to come Judge from heaven to throw all his and mine enemies into everlasting pains, but *to translate me with all his chosen unto himself* into celestial joys and everlasting glory."§

"Q. 53. What believest thou concerning the Holy Ghost? Answ. First, that he is true and co-eternal God with the eternal Father and the Son. Secondly, *that he is also given to me*, to make *me* through a true faith partaker of Christ and all his benefits, to comfort *me* and to abide with *me* for ever."‖

Many other of the answers are of a similar kind. Every person catechized, therefore, was taught to answer as if he himself was certainly one of "the elect," and had thus received the full benefit of baptism. And this was done from the belief that

---

* See their testimonies in c. vii. above. † See pp. 148—150, above.

‡ See p. 149, above.

§ The Sum of Christian Religion, &c., by Z. Ursinus. Lond. 1645. fol. p. 326. I quote purposely from Bishop Parry's translation.

‖ Ib. p. 335.

every one ought to feel assured that he was one of God's elect, as Ursinus himself (the author of this Catechism) explains it in his Commentary upon it :—

"Of our own election every of us not only may, but also ought to be in special certain and assured. And verily thereof we shall be certain by the effects thereof, namely, by conversion; that is, by true faith and repentance. For that we may believe and know that we are certainly chosen to eternal life, we are bound to believe in Christ and to believe also eternal life. But this we cannot believe, except we have true faith and repentance. And as every one ought to have both these, so every one ought certainly to hold that he is of the number of the elect; otherwise they shall accuse God of lying."*

Hence the only language they thought fit to put into the mouth of the person catechized, was that of one who felt assured that he was one of God's elect. Not that they would have encouraged the presumptuous hope of the sinner. Far from it. But they felt it to be their duty not to put any other language into the mouths of professing Christians, but what was applicable to the true child of God. And no doubt they hoped that such language might lead the sinner, though a child, to reflection and repentance, when he felt its *unsuitability* to his state.

And so far as our Catechism is concerned, it must be remembered that it was intended only for children, whom it was no doubt thought to be of prime importance to teach the language of the true child of God.

And now the reader (whatever may be his own views) will, I think, at once see, how little force there is in the argument derived from the use of such words in the Catechism, as if they showed what was considered to be necessarily the state of every one using the Catechism, and were not (as is the fact) used for the purpose of keeping the mind fixed upon the blessings which belong to the true child of God.

Whether it is desirable that such documents should be drawn up on such a principle, and what are its advantages and disadvantages, are questions which I shall not here stop to discuss. The mistakes and misconstructions to which the adoption of this principle has led would probably be *now* considered as affording strong reasons against it. My own view would, *even*

* Ib. p. 358

in theory, apart from the experience of the results, be adverse to the use of such language; while, knowing the meaning intended to be affixed to it by those who applied it in our Formularies, and that it was not intended to be understood as dogmatically affirming the state of all the baptized, I have not the smallest difficulty in accepting it. And I must add, that our Formularies, taken as a whole, appear to me to allow, and to have been intended to allow, a certain latitude for a difference of views in those called upon to subscribe them. But what I am here concerned with is, the doctrine of those who drew them up, and which they were evidently intended to favour. This is the first point to be settled in any inquiry as to the meaning which they were intended to admit.

Further, the Catechism—that is, that part of it with which we are here more particularly concerned—was, like the rest of the Prayer-book, submitted to the consideration of Bucer and Peter Martyr, for their remarks upon it,* and equally with the Baptismal Service received their approval, calling forth no remark or expression of a desire for any alteration.† And what their views were, has been abundantly demonstrated. This is another clear proof how the words were understood at the time when the Catechism was first put forth.

Lastly, as in the case of the Baptismal Service, so in that of the Catechism, we derive the strongest arguments for the interpretation here put upon it from the Cologne Liturgy. Here, again, Bucer's Form in that Liturgy led the way to the expressions used in our own.

In the Catechism inserted in the Cologne Liturgy at the commencement of the Office of Confirmation (and this was the original position of our own), we find the following questions and answers :—

"Dem. Dost thou then surely believe all these things?

"Answ. I believe them all, and I pray God, that he will vouchsafe to increase this faith in me.

* See the second section of the preceding chapter.

† See Buceri Scripta Anglic. pp. 482—486.

"Dem. What ought this faith to work in thee?

"Answ. That I doubt nothing, [nihil dubitem] but that God, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which with this his Son sent us his word, and gave us all things, is the only true God, that he made all things of nothing, that he only worketh and giveth all good things, and that he will show himself a father unto me also, for the same his Son's sake our Lord Jesus Christ,* *that he washed me from sins with holy baptism, that he gave me his Holy Spirit, that he incorporated me to his dear Son, and so received me into his Church, and adopted me to be his son and heir, that also he will keep me in his congregation, give me in the same repentance and remission of sins, and the communion of his Son,* that through him I may ever call upon his name with children's trust, and that in the renewing of myself I may profit daily unto his image; furthermore I believe that through his word and Sacraments *he will confirm and increase the same in me, so that I shall study continually to sanctify his name, and to serve his congregation with all manner of good works,* till he take me out of this world unto heavenly joys and the blessed resurrection. All which things I *acknowledge that they be performed unto me,* and shall be through the only free mercy of the heavenly Father and through the estimable merit of his Son our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Dem. God and our heavenly Father increase and confirm this thy faith, through his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, Amen. Dost thou think then, and dost thou *acknowledge in this faith,* that *thou* art *verily the son of God and his heir, the brother and joint heir of our Lord Jesu Christ,* and therefore a member of his body, which the congregation is?

"Answ. I think so and acknowledge, trusting in the most certain promise of God's benevolence and in the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ.

* * * * * * *

"Dem. How wast thou first *adopted of God to be his son,* and to be received into his congregation?

"Answ. *By holy baptism.*

"Dem. What is baptism?

"[Answ.] *The laver of regeneration,* WHEREBY I AM WASHED FROM SINS AND GRAFTED IN CHRIST THE LORD, AND HAVE PUT HIM UPON ME.

"Dem. Wilt thou continue in this communion of Christ unto the end?

---

* Abluisse me a peccatis Sacro Baptismate, donasse Spiritu Sancto, Filio suo dilecto incorporasse, atque ita in Ecclesiam suam assumpsisse, et in filium atque hæredem adoptasse, conservaturum etiam esse in Ecclesia, &c.

"Answ. I will by the help of our Lord Jesu Christ." (fol. 175—177.—*Lat.* fol. 80.)*

Such is a portion of the Catechism drawn up by Bucer for the Cologne Liturgy. I will only ask, can any one read it, and then say, that our own can only be interpreted as affirming the real condition of *every* child that uses it, while this is open to a different construction? It cannot be denied, that the affirmations put into the mouth of the child in the Cologne Form are as strong and explicit as those in our own. While we know well what the meaning and object of Bucer were in so wording them; and that he meant nothing *less* than that all children indiscriminately were spiritually regenerated in baptism.

Before I conclude this chapter, I would further direct the reader's attention to an Exposition of the Catechism which was published not long after it had attained its present form, subsequently to the Hampton Court Conference. This Exposition was written by Dr. John Mayer,† and the third, fourth, and fifth editions (published respectively in 1623, 1630, and 1635, 4to.), if not the earlier ones, are stated in the title page to be "published by command," and have the Royal arms prefixed, showing that they had received the highest sanction. This Exposition is, as far as I am aware, the first Exposition of the Catechism as it now stands, and certainly the first of any kind that had any degree of public sanction given to it.

The testimony, therefore, of this Exposition is certainly entitled to considerable weight in any inquiry as to the doctrine of our Church. It can hardly be said, at any rate, that doctrine formally supported by this Exposition is inadmissible. The last edition above-mentioned, it will be observed, was published after the accession of Archbishop Laud to the Primacy, whose censorship of the press is known to have been sufficiently rigid; and, therefore, whatever came out under his permission, can scarcely be now charged by his modern followers as irreconcileable with the doctrine of our Church. And remarkable it is, that in this

* The Latin may be seen in the Appendix.

† The English Catechism Explained, or, a Commentary on the Short Catechism set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, &c., by John Mayer, D.D.

fifth edition of the work, alterations and additions are inserted, admitting a greater efficacy in infant baptism than had been maintained in the previous editions, which, nevertheless, (as I have said) were "published by command." Even with the corrections of this fifth edition, however, the testimony of the work is entirely opposed to the views of our modern "High Churchmen." For all that is admitted in this edition is, that original sin is pardoned in all infants at their baptism, and that they are *thus far* regenerate; while in the context a distinction is expressly drawn between this regeneration and "spiritual regeneration."

I shall now, therefore, give the interpretation of the words, "Wherein I was made a member of Christ," &c., as it stands in the edition of 1630, "published by command;" adding afterwards the alterations introduced in that of 1635. He says, speaking of these words:—

"Which is not so to be understood, as though the outward washing of water did make the baptized partaker of these so excellent benefits: for it is true of the Sacraments of the New Testament, which was said of them of the Old; 'It is impossible, that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin.' (Heb. x. 4.) And in another place: 'Circumcision availeth nothing, but a new creature.' (Gal. vi. 15.) That the same may be said of Baptism, see in the Pharisees coming to John his Baptism: 'O generation of vipers (saith he), who hath forewarned you to fly from the wrath to come?' (Luke iii. 7.) Where he sheweth baptism to be a means of escaping God's wrath after an implicit manner; but withall requires virtue, which being away, baptism availeth not. And our Lord having commanded baptism to all, excepteth yet, saying, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' (Mark xvi. 16.) The case herein is divers. First, in those that are of ripe years and understanding, there is required of them a due disposition of repentance and faith, actually performed by and in themselves. But in infants it is enough [that is, as he explains it in a subsequent part of his Exposition, enough to entitle them to receive the sign and seal of the Covenant] that they pertain to the Covenant, being born in the bosom of the Church, and presented to the participation of gracious adoption by virtue of the faith of their parents.

"*The right understanding then of this is, that in our baptism we are* SACRAMENTALLY, *or* INSTRUMENTALLY, *made the children of God; and* REALLY AND TRULY *when we are together baptized with the Holy*

Ghost; if thou believe and be baptized, thou art made inheritor of the kingdom of heaven: and this is ascribed unto baptism. 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit,' &c. (John iii. 5): as converting, begetting unto Christ, and building men up in grace, is ascribed unto the officers of God's Church. Wherefore let no man mistake this matter, thinking himself safe, when he is baptized, for he may, nay, infinite numbers do, notwithstanding perish. Baptism confers not grace, *ex opere operato*, as the Church of Rome teacheth: but ever in men of years as they were found in grace, they were thought fit to be baptized. Read of the Eunuch, of Cornelius and his company, of the converts amongst the Jews at Peter's preaching. Now then consider, whether this be thy case or no? Art thou endued with grace? Art thou baptized with the Holy Ghost? Art thou baptized into Christ? Believest thou with all thy heart? Repentest thou with a true and due compunction? If it be thus, thou hast put on Christ, thou art 'buried with him by baptism into his death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead, so also thou shouldest walk in newness of life.' (Rom. vi. 2.) O well is thee, that thou art a member of Christ, and inheritor of heaven. If otherwise, thou hast been admitted to the water in vain, thou art still in thy sins. But thou wilt say, wherefore serves the remembrance of our baptism then? I answer, to confirm that grace, which is begun in a man's heart; if he believeth, he shall be hereby more confirmed; if he be a true Christian, he shall be hereby registered in the Catalogue of true Christians, and all the fiends of hell shall not be able to blot him out again. *If it be further demanded, how can it be said of all baptized that they are members of Christ, seeing there are many hypocrites, who bear only the badge of Christ, but fight under the banner of Satan; I answer, that our Church doth not usurp the gift of prophecy, to take upon her to discern which of her children* BELONG TO GOD'S UNSEARCHABLE ELECTION, *but* IN THE JUDGMENT OF CHARITY *embraceth them all, as God's inheritance; and hereby teacheth every of us so to believe of ourselves by faith, and of others by charity.* St. Paul in his salutations styleth the whole visible Churches to whom he writes by the title of Saints, and yet it is likely that by his extraordinary discerning spirit he could have differenced the goats of his flock from the sheep. *How much more ought we,* WITH OUR BLESSED MOTHER THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AT ALL CHASTENINGS [CHRISTENINGS] PRESUME *that Sacramental grace doth like a soul enquicken the body of the outward element, and receive those for our true fellow-members of Christ, who have been made partakers of the same laver of regeneration?*" (pp. 5—7.)

Thus the passage stood in at least three of the first four editions of this work so "published by command."

But in the edition of 1635, much of this is wholly omitted; but *the latter portion,* from the words, "our Church doth not usurp, &c." to the end, is RETAINED *verbatim* (except that "baptizings" is put for "christenings,") and then these words follow:—

"And this is true touching those that are of years of discretion, but infants being baptized, because there is certainly in them whatsoever may be expected in regard of their tender age, must needs be regenerated and born anew by this Sacrament, and if they die in their infancy, they are undoubtedly saved. For either they are all saved, or else baptism is in vain administered to some of them, seeing there can be nothing in an innocent child to hinder the efficacy thereof. Original sin then, of which only they stood guilty, is now done away by the blood of Christ working herein, although not so, but that it still remaineth in their nature, as appeareth by the breaking forth again, as they grow up, yet so, as that it is not imputed; and from the wrath to which they were hereby made subject, they are by baptism delivered, thus becoming new creatures and vessels of mercy." (p. 19.)

Here, clearly, baptism is considered to be always efficacious in infants for bringing the pardon of original sin; and so that they might *thus far* be considered as regenerated and born anew by it. But, meeting in the context the objections which he foresaw would be raised against this doctrine, he shows that he means only by such regeneration the change produced by the pardon of original sin, which in the case of infants he considered might be called regeneration. For thus he speaks,—

"*Ob.* If it be demanded, how then is it taught, that a man cannot fall from grace? 'the gifts and calling of God are without repentance,' and 'they that are born of God sin not, neither can they.'

"*Sol.* I answer, This is to be understood either of election,—he, to whom in the eternal decree of election, grace is given unto salvation, cannot fall from it: or, of actual grace, intimated in the word 'calling:'—he that is effectually called to grace by the preaching of the word, WHICH IS A SPIRITUAL REGENERATION, cannot fall from this grace again, of the child of God to become the child of the Devil: for because there is regeneration in the word, as well as in baptism, God is said to have begotten us by the immortal seed of the word. (Jam. i. 18.) It is not to be understood then of SACRAMENTAL REGENERATION, that they which are THUS born again and stated in grace cannot sin and be damned.

"*Ob.* If it be said, Then there is no certainty in God's election,

because the same man whom he hath chosen to grace in baptism, if he happen to die in his infancy, shall be saved, but if he liveth still, he may perish.

"I answer, The election of God yet remaineth sure: for although to us the living and dying of a child be accidental, yet it is certainly determined by the Lord, and so although he remitteth his sins in his baptism, yet knowing, that he shall live and sin, and be impenitent in his sins in his riper age, he *electeth him not*, but ordaineth him to the deeper damnation." (pp. 20, 21.)

The doctrine here advanced seems very similar to that of Bishop Davenant, noticed above.* And it is clear that he makes a great distinction between what he calls the regeneration of an infant in baptism by the pardon of original sin, and "spiritual regeneration." His doctrine avoids all the serious consequences that attach to the fiction of our modern "High Church-men" as to what takes place in the baptism of infants. The *great* question at issue is not affected by his concession in this 5th edition, (whether it be his own or not) as to the gift of the pardon of original sin. Bishop Carleton and many others have held this, who have entirely denied the universal spiritual regeneration of infants in baptism.

A few more extracts may confirm the view given above of the doctrine laid down in this work; and I shall continue my quotations from the 5th edition.

"If we consider the state of *the faithful*, they are regenerate and born again of God; wherefore they can no more be unborn, but the seed of God abideth in them, and therefore they cannot come into the condition of the seed of the serpent: if they sin, the Lord will correct them, but he will not take his mercy from them for ever. As he that is heir to any man, to whom he hath assured his estate, cannot but inherit, so God's heir shall certainly inherit his kingdom." (p. 31.)

Observing that "the children of believing parents" ought to be baptized, as federally holy, he says,—

"There is so near relation of the child unto the parents, that what the state of the parents is, such is the estate of the child reputed to be, *until that it cometh to reason and discretion*.... Howsoever in their infancy before they do good or evil, their parents' estate is reckoned theirs, as hath been said, yet in their elder age they are

* See pp. 304, 305, above.

taken as distinct persons subsisting by themselves, and standing or falling to themselves. If therefore in this due time they do not actually believe and repent, their baptism is made frustrate and vain unto them." (pp. 34, 35.)

"The invisible Church of God, viz. *all true believers*, are accepted for holy in Christ Jesus, at the very first act of their conversion unto the true faith, though before they were most unclean by sin.... Through faith all true believers are accepted for holy in Jesus Christ at the very instant of their conversion: this appeareth plainly, because that faith justifieth, that is, makes a man just and holy: faith ingrafteth into Jesus Christ, and maketh us partakers of his holiness: faith maketh, that Christ dwelleth in our hearts." (pp. 206, 207.)

Other passages might be added, but these are sufficient to show the doctrine of the work.

And this fifth edition was, as I have said, "published by command" under the primacy of Archbishop Laud.

CHAPTER XI.

ON THE SAVOY CONFERENCE, AND THE SUBSEQUENT REVIEW AND RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER BY CONVOCATION AND PARLIAMENT IN 1662.

The weighty testimony which may be produced from our early divines, against the views of the Laudian party on the subject of baptism and their representation of the doctrine of our Church, has caused some of our opponents to take refuge in an argument of this kind. Be it so, that your interpretation of the Prayer Book may have been that originally sanctioned and intended, and long held in the Church. But we owe our present Prayer Book to the leading divines of the period of the Restoration. The Book was accepted from them by Parliament, and sanctioned as their Book. And therefore we are bound to receive it now *in the sense which they affixed to it.*

I shall not waste much time in replying to such an argument, nor will I complain of drowning men catching at straws. But a few words to show the reader the true state of the case may be useful.

In the first place, then, the only document of a public kind we have, to show the sense which was affixed by any of these divines to the Prayer Book, is an anonymous account of the proceedings of the Savoy Conference published under the title, 'An Account of all the Proceedings of the Commissioners of both persuasions appointed by his sacred Majesty, according to Letters Patents, for the review of the Book of Common Prayer, &c. London, printed for R. H. 1661." 4to. Of this Book Richard Baxter says,—

"All these being surreptitiously printed, save the first piece, [that

is, the Exceptions of the Nonconformists] by some poor men for gain, without our knowledge and correction, are so falsely printed, that our wrong by it is very great. Whole lines are left out; the most significant words are perverted by alterations, and this so frequently, that some parts of the papers, especially our large reply, and our last account to the King, are made nonsense and not intelligible."*

We have not, then, a very trustworthy authority to go to for what did pass at the Savoy Conference. For such a production as that here spoken of may be as incorrect on one side as on the other.

But supposing the account to be correct, and that the leading divines of the party opposed to the Nonconformists took the ground they are represented as taking, (which in all probability they did, as the remaining leaders of the previously dominant Laudian party†,) what does it amount to? Simply this, that when at the Restoration the King appointed a Commission of certain divines to discuss the objections brought against the

---

* Life by Sylvester, B. i. P. 2. p. 379. I give the passage from Cardwell's Conferences connected with the Book of Common Prayer. 2d ed Oxf. 1841. 8vo. p. 263.

† The views of the leading Episcopal divines in this Conference are so well known, that it is hardly necessary to say, that on the question now before us as to the effects of baptism in infants, their views were those of the school of Mountagu and Laud, to which they owed their elevation. Thus, to the objection, "We cannot in faith say that every child that is baptized is regenerate," they reply,—"Seeing that God's Sacraments have their effects, where the receiver doth not '*ponere obicem*,' put any bar against them (which children cannot do), we may say in faith of every child that is baptized, that it is regenerated by God's Holy Spirit." (Cardwell's Conferences, p. 356.) This of course was the view which they took of the matter; and I could have also pointed those who adduce it to an earlier and (to my mind) better testimony (though only that of an individual) to the same effect. But what is that, to the *host* of opponents which the doctrine has among our earlier divines? I believe that not one single testimony to this effect could be produced in the writings of our divines previous to the early part of the 17th century. And I have already shown what the amount of testimony is *against* it. And I say, with our learned Bishop Abbot, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Bishop of Salisbury,—"Papisticum illud Scholasticorum pronunciatum, quod operis operati fundamentum est,....*nescio qua fronte* tanquam catholicæ fidei dogma proponitur, 'Sacramenta semper conferre suum effectum non ponenti obicem.'" (See p. 280 above.) And with our learned Bishop Carleton, that it is "peregrina et incondita sententia," and before the time of the later scholastic divines unheard of even in the Church of Rome. (See p. 338 above.)

Book of Common Prayer, the surviving bishops, being of course inclined to Laudian views, maintained in the Conference that interpretation of the Prayer Book which was consistent with their theological system.

For, the review of the Prayer Book which preceded its re-establishment by the Act of Uniformity, was not made at the Savoy Conference (as is often erroneously stated), but afterwards in Convocation.

The Commission that sat at the Savoy was appointed for only four months; and the whole of that time having been spent in useless altercation between the opposing parties, it came to an end without producing any result of any kind;* terminating on the 24th of July, 1661.†

In the mean time, namely, early in May, the Convocation had met, and proceeded at once with a review of the Liturgy, which review was not finished until the following December; but, "on the 20th of December, 1661, the Book of Common Prayer [so revised] was adopted and subscribed by the Clergy of both Houses of Convocation and of both Provinces."‡ In the following March, after a further slight revision, this book was printed,§ and was accepted as it stood by both Houses of Parliament.

But neither were any alterations or additions made that can affect the question we are now considering, nor have we any record of the sense affixed to the Prayer Book by Convocation, much less any declaration that the Prayer Book was to be understood according to a certain mode of interpretation. There is not the slightest pretext for saying that Convocation ever contemplated anything of the kind. And though the probability is, that, in the circumstances under which that Convocation met, the Laudian party formed the majority, there is also every reason to think, that there was a considerable and respectable body of its members, who would have been entirely opposed to any such proceeding.

Further, that Parliament sanctioned the Book of Common Prayer as the Book of the Convocation of that period, and in

---

* See Cardwell's Conferences, pp. 264—266.
† Ib. p. 369.
‡ Ib. p. 372.
§ Ib. p. 373.

their view of its meaning, is not merely a groundless assertion, but directly opposed to the testimony of facts and of the Act itself by which the Book was confirmed, that is, the Act of Uniformity.

For we find that the House of Commons (however indisposed to favour the violent Nonconformists) were very jealous of any alterations being made in the Book by Convocation, lest they should introduce into it Laudian views. So little were they inclined to defer to the views of Convocation about the Prayer Book, that on the 9th of July, 1661, before Convocation had had time to make any progress in their revision of the Book, "a 'Bill for the uniformity of public Prayer and administration of the Sacraments,' was read for the third time, and, together with a copy of the Prayer Book, printed in 1604, was passed and sent to the Upper House;"* the book of 1604 being selected, Dr. Cardwell supposes, in order to avoid any alterations by Archbishop Laud. The consideration of this Bill was deferred by the Lords, and its first reading did not take place till the 14th of February, 1662. "Three days afterwards it passed through the second reading, and was placed in the hands of a select committee. The Book of Common Prayer, however, [that is, the Book as revised by Convocation] was not yet delivered to them; and the Committee having inquired on the 13th of February, with strong symptoms of impatience, whether they should still wait for it, or should 'proceed upon the book brought from the Commons,' they received a Royal message on the 25th of the same month, together with an authentic copy of the corrected Prayer Book confirmed under the Great Seal."† This revised Book having been substituted for the other, and some other amendments introduced into the Bill, the Bill passed the House of Lords on the 9th of April, 1662, and was returned to the House of Commons. The House of Lords was satisfied with the alterations made, and passed them *sub silentio*; but as to the sense in which the Book was understood, each member of course acted upon his own view of it. And it is very clear, that they did not consider themselves bound to abide by what took place in Convocation, for they proceeded as far as the Committee with

* Ib. p. 376. † Ib. p. 377.

the Book of 1604, when they must have known that Convocation had completed a revision of the Book, and were evidently inclined to have brought the matter to a conclusion upon that Book, if the revised Book had not been at once submitted to them.

But the feeling with which the House of Commons acted in the matter is still more strongly marked; for when the Bill was returned to them from the Lords with the revised Book of Common Prayer, "it appears," says Dr. Cardwell, "that the Commons were jealous of the preference given to the corrected Book of Common Prayer over the edition of 1604, and suspecting that some differences might have been introduced between the two periods when the books were respectively printed,* *directed a close comparison to be made between them.* On the 16th of April, they proceeded so far in their fear of change, as to make it a question *whether they should not reconsider the corrections made in Convocation:* and though they decided to adopt them without further examination, *the division was only of ninety-six to ninety in their favour.* In order to save the dignity of the House, they afterwards divided on the question whether they had the power of reconsidering such corrections, and then obtained a vote in the affirmative."† And Dr. Cardwell adds, that "*the fear, which the Commons seem to have contracted*, that occasion would be taken for introducing into the Liturgy the religious sentiments of Archbishop Laud and his school of theologians, was not altogether without foundation."‡ Glad enough, no doubt, would the Laudian party have been, if they could have introduced various alterations into our Formularies at this time. But, providentially, the power of doing so was not in their hands.

So much, then, for the feelings with which the Houses of Parliament were actuated on this occasion.

But, finally, what are the words of the Act itself of Uniformity?

The first clause of it runs thus,—

---

* Dr. Cardwell observes in a note, that "the corrected book was probably a copy of the printed edition of 1634, (at which time Laud was Archbishop of Canterbury,) with the corrections [made in Convocation] inserted."

† Ib. p. 378. ‡ Ib. p. 389.

"Whereas *in the first year of the late Queen Elizabeth* there was one uniform order of Common Service, &c. .... set forth in one book, intituled *The Book of Common Prayer*, &c. .... and whereas by the great and scandalous neglect of Ministers in using *the said Order or Liturgy* so set forth and enjoined as aforesaid, great mischiefs and inconveniences, during the times of the late unhappy troubles, have arisen and grown, &c. .... his Majesty hath been pleased to authorize and require the Presidents of the said Convocations, and other the Bishops and Clergy of the same, to review *the said Book* of Common Prayer, and the Book of the Form and Manner of the making and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and that after mature consideration they should make such additions and alterations in *the said books* respectively, as to them should seem meet and convenient .... since which time they, the said Presidents, &c. .. have made some alterations .... all which his Majesty having duly considered, hath fully approved and allowed the same, and recommended to this present Parliament, That THE SAID BOOKS of Common Prayer, and of the Form of Ordination and Consecration of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, *with the alterations and additions* which have been so made and presented to his Majesty by the said Convocations, be the Book which shall be appointed to be used, &c. .... be it enacted," &c.

Here, then, it is expressly stated, that the Book sanctioned by the Act, is the Book of Queen Elizabeth WITH *certain alterations and additions*. The alterations and additions only are received from Convocation. The Book, otherwise, is recognized as the Book previously in use from the days of Elizabeth, and authorized *as such*.

It would be abusing the patience of the reader to dwell longer on this point.

CHAPTER XII.

TESTIMONIES FROM OUR DIVINES SINCE THE RESTORATION, CHIEFLY OF THE ARMINIAN SCHOOL, ON THE SUBJECT OF THIS WORK.

The reason for my closing the series of authorities cited in a previous chapter, at a particular period of the history of our Church, was, that about that time the school of our Reformers and early divines was superseded in the high places of the Church by a party of very different theological views. Little could be learnt from the statements of such men as Laud and Mountagu, and their adherents, as to the intended meaning of the Formularies of our Church. And great reason have we for thankfulness, that it was not permitted them, either during their first enjoyment of power in the reign of Charles I., or when they partially regained the ascendancy on the restoration of Charles II., to make any material alterations in the Formularies bequeathed to us by our martyred Reformers. These remaining, there remained among us under all circumstances the seeds of truth. In them the Church has ever had within her witnesses to the truth, whose voice could not be altogether stifled.

But the success of the Romanizing school of Laud and his party, was such as completely to overwhelm for the time the influence of the school of the Reformers, and turn the current theology of our Church into a very different channel.

In the early part of the seventeenth century, indeed, there was a considerable movement among the Protestant Churches generally, both in this country and on the Continent, which issued in the formation of different schools of theology within their several communions. And their Formularies, in some cases left open,

to a certain extent, to different modes of interpretation, were claimed by all parties as at least admitting the sense they wished to assign to them.

From that period the ministers of our Church have become the followers of several different theological systems. And the prevailing schools have no doubt been the Arminian and the Romanizing, the former developing itself occasionally into what has been called the Latitudinarian. And political events in the time of James II. having caused the secession of the leaders of the latter school, to form what was called the Nonjuring party, the former remained for more than a century in almost exclusive possession of the high places of the Church.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that the language in which the great majority of our more modern divines have spoken on such subjects as that before us, should be very different from that which we find in our early writers. And they who class our leading divines of different periods together, and put their statements side by side, as if they all belonged to the same school of theology, and always meant the same thing when using the same words, are likely to run into the most mistaken notions as to the meaning of their testimonies.

But nevertheless, on the subject of our present inquiry, it will be found, that the great body of the Arminian divines, up to a very recent period, were, on the main point of the controversy, agreed with our early writers. For though they speak of regeneration as universally taking place in infants in baptism, it was not generally held by them to be that spiritual regeneration by which a new principle of life is implanted in the soul, but a regeneration of a peculiar and inferior kind, either meaning only an admission into the visible Church, and to the enjoyment of its privileges, or at most including only, in addition, the pardon of original sin, and thus placing them in a state of acceptance so long as their infantine state lasted.

That this is a correct representation of their views, is proved both by their direct statements to this effect, and also by their almost universal practice of admonishing adults of the necessity of their being *regenerated* to their having any ground of hope before God, and placing the sole and necessary evidences of that regeneration in their bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit. The

testimonies which might be produced from their works to this effect are innumerable. But I shall not trouble the reader with more than a few from certain well-known authors, whose names will probably be considered as affording sufficient evidence of the extensive prevalence of the views they maintained.

I now proceed therefore to give a few testimonies from the works of our later divines; not absolutely excluding *all* who speak the same language as that of our early divines, but confining myself almost entirely to writers of the Arminian school.

BISHOP W. NICOLSON;

Bishop of Gloucester from 1660 *to* 1672.

Bishop Nicolson is said by Anthony Wood to have been "a right learned divine, well seen and read in the Fathers and Schoolmen."* And it must be observed, that he formed one of the Upper House of Convocation at the Review of the Liturgy in 1661 and 1662.

The following extracts are from his Exposition of the Church Catechism.

On the words, "a member of Christ," he observes,—

"That is, to be reckoned Christians: for Christ is the head of the Church, and all Christians the body, of which every one that professeth Christian religion is a part, and is so to be esteemed. But these parts are of two sorts, 1st, Either *æquivocal* parts, *so taken and reputed by us, such as are a glass eye, or a wooden leg to a man, which are so called, but truly are not such:* and whosoever profess the supernatural verities revealed by Christ, and make use of the Holy Sacraments, may in this sense be called the members of Christ, because they are reckoned for parts of his visible body. 2nd, Or *univocal* parts, That in name and nature are true believers, which are indeed the true members of Christ, and do belong unto his mystical body, and receive from him as from their Head, life, sense, and motion. They are united to him, live in him, and are informed by his Spirit. They are washed and regenerated by his blood. And they have his righteousness imputed unto them, by which they are freed from the guilt and punishment of sin. This the Apostle teacheth, 1 Cor. i. 30. 'But

* Athen. Oxon. vol. 3. col. 951.

of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, redemption.' And *to these last only the two next privileges belong*:"* that is, to be "the child of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven."

Speaking of the Sacraments, he says,—

"All receive not the grace of God, that receive the sacraments of grace. But by them grace is offered to all the Church, though exhibited only to the faithful."†

On the answer that children are baptized because they promise faith and repentance by their sureties, he says,—

"This is an excellent answer, and being well examined will prove satisfactory. For it shows,

"1. How children perform this promise for faith and repentance.

"2. That they are bound to perform the promise, when they come to age, if they mean to have a part of the grace promised by God in baptism.

"1. For the first, children perform not this promise in baptism at that time actually, that is, they do not then actually repent and believe: neither is it necessary they should. For baptism is not the covenant, but *the seal of it; and the seal may be set where these are wanting.* This is evident in the case of circumcision."‡

"Repentance is a firm resolution of amendment of life; faith an apprehension of God's promises: for the performance of which the sureties engage; but not absolutely that the child shall do it, for that is beyond their power to undertake; but conditionally, that he shall do it, or else *have no benefit by their engagement.*"§

BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR;

Bishop of Down and Connor from 1660; *and of Dromore from* 1661 *to* 1669.

"Although, by the present custom of the Church, we are baptized in our infancy, and do not actually reap that fruit of present pardon

* "A plain but full Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England," pp. 15, 16, of the first ed. printed Lond. 1655. 4to. The author published a 2nd. ed. (a reprint, except in immaterial points, of the first) in 1661, when he was Bishop of Gloucester, and dedicated it to Dr. Sheldon, then Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. It has been frequently reprinted.

† Ib. p. 169. ‡ Ib. pp. 179, 180. § Ib. p. 187.

which persons of a mature age in the Primitive Church did (for we yet need it not, as we shall when we have past the calentures of youth, which was the time which the wisest of our fathers in Christ chose for their baptism, as appears in the instance of St. Ambrose, St. Austin, and divers others); yet we must remember that there is *a baptism of the Spirit as well as of water:* and whenever this happens, *whether it be together with that baptism of water,* as usually it was *when only men and women of years of discretion were baptized;* or *whether it be ministered in the rite of confirmation,* which is an admirable suppletory of an early baptism, and intended by the Holy Ghost for a corroborative of baptismal grace, and a defensative against danger; *or that lastly, it be performed by an internal and merely spiritual ministry, when we, by acts of our own election, verify the promise made in baptism, and so bring back the rite, by receiving the effect of baptism:* that is, whenever the 'filth of our flesh is washed away,' and that we have 'the answer of a pure conscience towards God,' *which St. Peter affirms to be the true baptism,* and which, by the purpose and design of God, it is expected we should not defer longer than a great reason or a great necessity enforces: when our sins are first expiated, and the sacrifice and death of Christ is made ours, and we made God's by a more immediate title (which at some time or other happens to all Christians that pretend to any hopes of heaven); then let us look to our standing and 'take heed lest we fall.' "*

This passage is decisive of the question, whether Bishop Taylor held that the baptism of the Spirit always accompanied the baptism of water in the case of infants.

To the same effect he speaks frequently in his Sermons, as may appear by the following extracts.

"*The first great instrument of changing our whole nature into the state of grace,* flesh into the spirit, is a firm *belief,* and a perfect assent to, and hearty entertainment of the promises of the Gospel."†

"Our hearers make use of sermons and discourses evangelical but to fill up void spaces of their time, to help to tell an hour with, or pass it without tediousness. The reason of this is a sad condemnation to such persons: they have not yet entertained the Spirit of God, they are in darkness: *they were washed in water, but never baptized with the Spirit;* for these things are spiritually discerned. They

* Life of Christ, Pt. 2. § 12. disc. 9. Works, ed. Heber, 3d ed. 1839. vol. 2. pp. 408, 409.

† Serm. on Matt. xxvi. 11, on "the flesh and the Spirit." Sermons, ed. 1678. fol. p. 76.

would think the preacher rude, if he should say they are not Christians, they are not within the covenant of the Gospel: but it is certain that the Spirit of manifestation is not yet upon them; and that is the *first effect of the Spirit, whereby we can be called sons of God, or relatives of Christ.*"*

And he adds at the conclusion of the same sermon,—

"The sum is this: an animal man, a man under the Law, a carnal man (for as to this they are all one) is sold under sin..... But a spiritual man, a man that is in the state of grace, *who is born anew of the Spirit, that is regenerate by the Spirit of Christ,* he is led by the Spirit, he lives in the Spirit," &c.†

Other similar passages might easily be added.

BISHOP EZEKIEL HOPKINS;

Bishop of Raphoe from 1671 *to* 1681; *and of Derry from* 1681 *to* 1690.

Bishop Hopkins, in his "Doctrine of the two Sacraments," enters fully upon the question of the effects of the Sacrament of Baptism, both in the case of adults and infants.

The following extracts will show his views on the subject.

"There are two ways of dedication unto God; whereby his title takes place, and what is so devoted becomes his. The one external, by men: as in the instances before cited: whereby there was no change at all wrought in the nature of the thing thus dedicated, but only a change in the relation and propriety of it. . . . The other dedication is internal, and wrought by God himself. And thus he is said to separate or dedicate persons to himself, when, by the effectual operation of the Holy Ghost upon them, he endows them with those habits which enable them to do him service. . . .

"As there is this twofold dedication or separation, so there is also a twofold sanctification. There is an external relation, or ecclesiastical sanctification; which is nothing else, but the devoting or giving up of a thing or person unto God, by those who have a power so to do. There is an internal, real, and spiritual sanctification: and, in this

* Serm. 1. for Whitsunday, on Rom viii. 9, 10. Ib. p. 202.
† Ib. p. 215.

sense, a man is said to be sanctified, when the Holy Ghost doth infuse into his soul the habits of divine grace, and maketh him partaker of the divine nature, whereby he is inwardly qualified to glorify God in a holy life . . .

" In applying this distinction to Baptism, and to show you how it is that Baptism doth sanctify, I shall lay down these following propositions.

" 1. Baptism is the immediate means of our external and relative sanctification unto God.

" By this Holy Sacrament, all that are partakers of it are dedicated and separated unto him.

" There are, if I may so express it, but two regiments of men; the one is of the world; the other is of the Church. And in one of these all mankind are listed and do march. . . .

" This Church of Christ may be considered, either as visible or invisible. The visible Church of Christ on earth, is a sort of people who profess the name of Christ, and own his doctrine; joining together in a holy society and communion of worship, where it can be enjoyed. The invisible Church of Christ on earth is a number of true believers who have internal and invisible communion with Jesus Christ by their faith and his Spirit. The visible Church is of a much larger extent than the invisible; for it comprehends hypocrites, and too many ungodly persons; yea, all those who have given up their names unto Christ, and make a visible profession of his doctrine, though by their lives and practice they deny it. . . .

" From this distinction it follows,

" (1) That all, that are of the visible Church of Christ Jesus, are taken out of the world; so that it may truly be said of them, that they are not of the world.

* * * * * * *

" (2) Hence it follows, that all those who are members of the visible Church, may truly be called saints, and members of Christ, and the children and people of God; because, by being taken into the Church, they are taken out of the World; and so become God's portion, and the lot of his inheritance.

[He here proceeds to show that so Scripture speaks of such.]

" (3) But to bring this home to our present subject of Baptism: from all this it evidently follows, that those who are baptized may, in this ecclesiastical and relative sense, be truly called saints, the children of God, and members of Christ; and, thereupon, inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.

" Doubtless, so far forth Baptism is a means of sanctification, as it

is the solemn admission of persons into the visible Church; as it separates them from the world, and from all false religions in it, and brings them out of the visible kingdom of the devil into the visible kingdom of Jesus Christ. For, if all that are admitted into the visible Church are thereby, as I have proved to you, dignified with the title of Saints and the children of God, then, by baptism, which is the solemn way of admitting them into the Church, they may, with very good reason, be said to be made Saints, the children of God and members of Christ. But this is only a relative sanctity, not a real: and many such saints and sanctified men there are, who shall never enter into heaven. . . . This sanctification, regeneration, and adoption, conferred upon us at our admission into the visible Church, is external and ecclesiastical: and though it alone will suffice to the salvation of infants, because they are thereby as holy as their state can make them capable of; yet it will not suffice to the salvation of grown and adult persons, if they contradict it by the course of a wicked life. . . .

"2. Another position is this, That Baptism is not so the means of an internal and real sanctification, as if all to whom it is administered were thereby spiritually renewed, and made partakers of the Holy Ghost in his saving grace.

"Though an external and ecclesiastical sanctification be effected by Baptism, *ex opere operato*, by the mere administration of that Holy Sacrament; yet so is *not an internal and habitual sanctification:* and that, whether we respect adult persons or infants.

* * * * * * *

"Baptism was not instituted to any such purpose that it should be an instrument of working a real change upon infants: for neither can it work this change by any immediate and proper efficiency, since the washing of the body cannot thus affect the soul, nor infuse any gracious habits into it which itself hath not; neither can it work morally, by way of suasion and argument, because infants have not the use of reason to apprehend any such. Again, if this Baptismal Regeneration be real, by the infusion of habitual grace, how comes it to pass, that the greater part of those who have received it lead profane and unholy lives, and too too many perish in their sins? They who have the seed of God in them shall never sin unto death; and the perseverance of those who are inwardly and effectually sanctified, is safe and certain: for, surely, true grace is saving, and true and saving grace is the effect of our election unto eternal life: for 'whom he did predestinate, them he also called.' Rom. viii. 30. And therefore *I judge it unsound doctrine to affirm, that Baptism doth confer real sanctification upon all infants,* as well as upon some adult persons, who are made partakers of it.

"But here may some say, 'If Baptism doth not confer a real and internal regeneration on infants, who partake thereof, how then is it, that the Church hath appointed a prayer in the Office of Baptism, wherein we bless God, that it hath pleased him to regenerate the baptized infant with his Holy Spirit?'

"To this I answer, that the Baptismal regeneration of infants is external and ecclesiastical. . . . . .

"'But how then are infants said, in Baptism, to be regenerated by the Holy Spirit, if he doth not inwardly sanctify them in and by that ordinance?'

"I answer: Because the whole economy and dispensation of the kingdom of Christ is managed by the Spirit of Christ; so that those who are internally sanctified, are regenerated by his effectual operation; and those who are only externally sanctified are regenerated by his public institution. Infants therefore are in Baptism regenerated by the Holy Ghost, because the Holy Spirit of God appoints this ordinance to receive them into the visible Church, which is the regenerate part and state of the world. . . .

"3. It is not so the means of sanctification, as if none could be internally and really sanctified, who are necessarily deprived of that holy ordinance.

* * * * * *

"4. The last position is this, That Baptism is an ordinary means appointed by Christ, for the real and effectual sanctification of his Church.

"For, this is the great end of all Gospel ordinances, that, through them, might be conveyed that grace which might purify the heart and cleanse the life. And, though I do not affirm that baptism doth effect this in all to whom it is rightly applied: not in infants, who, while such, are incapable of that work; nor in many adult persons, who, though baptized, may remain still in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity: yet this I do affirm and maintain, that there is no reason to doubt the salvation of any, who, by this holy ordinance, are consecrated unto God, until, by their actual and wilful sinning, they thrust away from them those benefits which God intends them by it. . . . . .

"From all this that hath been said on this subject, I shall draw this one deduction, and so conclude. Hence we may learn what to judge, and what to hope, concerning the state of infants who die baptized.

"Certainly, since they are in covenant with God; since they are the members of Christ, being members of his Body, the Church; since they are sanctified and regenerated, so far forth as their natures are

ordinarily capable of, without a miracle; we have all the reason in the world comfortably to conclude, that all such die in the Lord, and are for ever happy and blessed with him.

"With very good reason, therefore, and upon very clear evidence, hath our Church determined, that 'it is certain, by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.' Rubric after Baptism. . . . . .

"Yea, let me add, that not only infants baptized, but all infants of believing parents, though they should unavoidably die before baptism, yea before they see the light, are in the same safe and blessed condition, for they are in the same gracious covenant. For since the promise is made to believers and to their children, God will not falsify his promise, where they break no conditions."*

BISHOP JOHN PEARSON;

Bishop of Chester from 1673 *to* 1686.

Bishop Pearson's "Exposition of the Creed" has long been a standard work among us. The following passages will show his views on the question before us.

"The whole Church of God, as it containeth in it all the persons which were called to the profession of the faith of Christ, or were baptized in his name, may well be termed and believed holy. . . The Church, as it embraceth all the professors of the true faith of Christ, containeth in it not only such as do truly believe and are obedient to the word, but those also which are hypocrites and profane. . . . . Of these promiscuously contained in the Church, such as are *void of all saving grace* while they live, and communicate with the rest of the Church, and when they pass out of this life die in their sins, and remain under the eternal wrath of God; as they were not in their persons holy while they lived, so are they no way of the Church after their death, neither as members of it, nor as contained in it. Through their own demerit they fall short of the glory unto which they were called: and being by death separated from the external communion of the Church, and *having no true internal communion with the members and the Head thereof*, are totally and finally cut off from the Church of Christ. On the contrary, such as are *efficaciously* called justified and sanctified, while they live are truly holy,

* Works of Bishop Hopkins, ed. by Pratt. Lond. 1809, 8vo. vol. ii. pp. 417—429.

and when they die are perfectly holy; nor are they by their death separated from the Church, but remain united still by virtue of *that internal union by which they were before conjoined both to the members and the Head.*"*

Commenting on the words, "The Communion of Saints," he says,—

"Because though the Church be holy, yet every person contained in it is not truly so, therefore is added this part of the Article, which concerneth those who are *truly such* ... All such persons as are called from the vulgar and common condition of the world unto any peculiar service or relation unto God, are thereby denominated holy, and in some sense receive the name of Saints. The penmen of the Old Testament do often speak of the people of Israel as of a holy nation, and God doth speak unto them as to a people holy unto himself; because he had chosen them out of all the nations of the world, and appropriated them to himself. Although therefore most of that nation were rebellious to him which called them, and void of all true, inherent, and actual sanctity; yet because they were all in that manner separated, they were all, as to the separation, called holy. In the like manner those of the New Testament, writing to such as were called, and had received and were baptized in the faith, give unto them all the name of Saints, *as being in some manner such, by being called and baptized. For being baptism is a washing away of sin, and the purification from sin is a proper sanctification; being every one who is so called and baptized is thereby separated from the rest of the world which are not so, and all such separation is some kind of sanctification; being, though the work of grace be not perfectly wrought, yet when the means are used,* WITHOUT SOMETHING APPEARING TO THE CONTRARY, WE OUGHT TO PRESUME OF THE GOOD EFFECT; therefore all such as have been received into the Church, may be in some sense called holy. But because there is more than an outward vocation, *and a charitable presumption*, necessary to make a man holy; therefore we must find some other qualification which must make him really and truly such, not only by an extrinsical denomination, but by a real and internal affection. What this sanctity is, and who are capable of this title properly, we must learn out of the Gospel of Christ; by which alone, ever since the Church of Christ was founded, any man can become a Saint. Now by the tenor of the Gospel, we shall find, that those are truly and properly saints, which are 'sanctified in Christ Jesus.' (1 Cor. i. 2.) First,

* On Art. ix. ed. Dobson, Lond. 1832. 8vo. pp. 515, 516.

In respect of THEIR HOLY FAITH, BY WHICH THEY ARE REGENERATED; for, 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God' (1 John v. 1.); by which they are purged, God himself 'purifying their hearts by faith' (Acts xv. 9.), whereby they 'are washed, sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus' (1 Cor. vi. 11.); 'in whom also, *after that they believe, they are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.*' (Eph. i. 13.) Secondly, In respect of their conversation," &c.*

DEAN DUREL:

Dean of Windsor from 1677 *till his death in* 1683. *Previously Prebendary of Windsor and Durham, and Chaplain to the King.*

Dr. John Durel is spoken of by Anthony Wood, (a contemporary, and, beyond all doubt, one of the highest of "High Churchmen") in the following terms,—

"He was a person of unbiassed and fixed principles, untainted and steady loyalty, as constantly adhering to the sinking cause and interest of his sovereign in the worst of times; who dared with an unshaken and undaunted resolution to stand up and maintain the honour and dignity of the English Church, when she was in her lowest and deplorable condition. He was very well versed, also, in all the controversies on foot between the Church and the disciplinarian party; the justness and reasonableness of the established constitutions of the former no one of late years hath more plainly manifested, or with greater learning more successfully defended against its most zealous modern oppugners than he hath done, as by his works following is manifest."†

He then gives a list of his works, of which the principal is that which I am about to quote, entitled, "Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ adversus iniquas atque inverecundas Schismaticorum criminationes Vindiciæ, &c. Lond. 1669." 4to.‡

The subject of the 26th chapter of this work is,—"On the Efficacy of Baptism, Whether in the Anglican Liturgy it is esteemed greater than it really is." ("De Efficacia Baptismi, An major juxta Liturgiam Anglicanam quam par est, habeatur.")

* Ib. pp. 527, 528. † Athen. Oxon. iv. 89. ed. Bliss.

‡ Some copies of this work occur with the following title,—"Historia rituum S. Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ ex omni antiquitate eruta, &c. Lond. 1672."

And it is written in reply to the objection of the Nonconformists, that our Baptismal Service for Infants implies that all infants are spiritually regenerated in baptism. I regret that it is impossible, from the space required, to transfer the whole chapter to these pages, as the charge is most ably met and refuted. I must content myself with the following extracts.

"Inasmuch as Baptism is a sacrament or visible sign and most certain pledge of that invisible grace which embraces both blessings, namely, the washing away of guilt and the cleansing from corruption, as being that which was appointed by God to signify, seal, and instrumentally exhibit it, therefore, not only in that sentence of our Liturgy which the Apologist here attacks, but among all the approved authors among the Reformed, where that sacred laver is treated of, phrases occur of such a nature that IGNORANT MEN may easily conclude from them, that that grace of the Holy Spirit with which Baptism, *when administered to those who have right dispositions*, is always attended, is the effect of the Sacrament itself. Such is this saying of Calvin,—'We assert that Baptism is God's ordinary instrument to wash and renew us, in a word to communicate salvation' (Antid. cap. de Bapt. can. 5.); which if the Apologist should read in the Book of Common Prayer, he would immediately be altogether horrified at it. For why should he not infer from it, *equally as from any words that occur in that Book*, 'that there is ascribed to the Sacrament of Baptism a power to renew and necessarily save all men that are initiated by it.' And yet similar speeches are frequently found in the same author and the other Reformed writers, which is known to those who have paid the slightest attention to their works. Nor ought any one to be surprised at that, since Holy Scripture has in various passages gone before them in this matter, Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27; Tit. iii. 5; Eph. v. 26. . . . . .

"Then as to what he says, 'that no one can be a minister of the Reformed Church of England who is not certainly persuaded of the regeneration of every infant baptized,' *neither also is that true.* The minister truly gives thanks to God after each infant has been baptized, that it hath pleased God to regenerate him with his Holy Spirit. But it does not thence follow, that he ought to be certain of the regeneration of every infant baptized. *For it is sufficient if he is persuaded of the regeneration of some only, for instance of elect infants, or, if you like, even of some only of their number, that on that account he may be able, nay ought, to give God thanks for each and all baptized. Since who is elected, he knows not; and since it is but just, that he should,* BY THE JUDGMENT OF CHARITY, PRESUME, *that*

as many as he baptizes are elect, and, if any are regenerated in Baptism (which none but a Socinian or other Catabaptist will deny), regenerated."*

And then observing, that all the Reformed Churches, including the Anglican, declare that the wicked, when partaking of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, are by no means partakers of Christ, he adds,—

"But since as many as come to that sacred feast with right dispositions, such feed spiritually, that is by faith, upon the most holy body and blood of Christ, the minister rightly, when the holy Eucharist has been celebrated, gives thanks to God, that he has refreshed all the communicants (although he is not and cannot be certain of each) with that heavenly food. Why should he not therefore do the same after the administration of holy baptism to every infant? Why, I say, should he not give thanks to God for the regeneration of each one

* Quia gratiæ illius invisibilis, quæ utrumque beneficium, reatus ablutionem scilicet et maculæ purgationem complectitur, sacramentum seu signum visibile atque pignus certissimum baptismus est, ut qui ad illam significandam, obsignandamque, atque instrumentaliter exhibendam a Deo institutus fuit: ideo, non tantùm in ea periodo Liturgiæ nostræ, quam hic oppugnat Apologista, sed apud omnes probatos Reformatorum authores, ubi de sacro illo lavacro agitur, occurrunt ejusmodi locutiones, ut ex iis facile inferant HOMINES IMPERITI, gratiam illam Spiritus Sancti quam Baptismus *rite dispositis* administratus semper habet comitem, esse ipsius Sacramenti effectum. Talis est hæc Calvini locutio:—"Nos Baptismum ordinarium Dei instrumentum asserimus ad nos lavandos, et renovandos, ad salutem denique communicandam." (Antid. cap. de Baptism. can. 5.) Quam si in libro Liturgico legeret Apologista, ad eam statim totus cohorresceret. Quidni enim ex ea, æque atque *ex ullis verbis quæ in illo libro occurrunt*, inferat, "Sacramento Baptismi vim ascribi omnium hominum, qui eo initiantur, regenerativam ac necessario salvificam?" Attamen similes locutiones apud eumdem authorem, aliosque Reformatos Scriptores frequentes reperiuntur, quod norunt qui eorum libros vel levi manu versavere. Neque id mirum cuiquam esse debet, cùm iis eâ in re præiverit Scriptura sacra variis locis, Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27; Tit. iii. 5; Ephes. v. 26.....

Deinde quod ait, "Neminem posse esse ministrum Reformatæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, qui non certò persuasus sit de regeneratione cujuslibet infantis baptizati," *neque id etiam verum est* Deo quidem gratias agit Minister post baptizatum unumquemque parvulum, quòd Deo placuerit cum Spiritu suo regenerare. Sed non inde sequitur eum de cujuslibet parvuli baptizati regeneratione certum esse debere. *Sufficit enim si de quorumdam tantùm, electorum infantum puta, aut si vis etiam aliquorum duntaxat ex eorum numero, regeneratione persuasus sit, ut eo nomine possit, imo debeat, Deo gratias agere pro omnibus et singulis baptizatis. Quippe cùm quis sit electus, ipsum lateat; cumque par sit, eum, quotquot baptizat,* EX JUDICIO CHARITATIS, *electos, et si qui in Baptismo regenerantur, (quod nemo nisi Socinianus aliusve Catabaptista, negaverit) regeneratos* PRÆSUMERE." (p. 290.)

whom God has vouchsafed to admit to the laver of regeneration? Certainly the reason is the same in both cases."*

"Moreover Ames himself grants, 'that God infuses a habit or principle of grace into some while they are baptized.' (Bellarm. enerv. tom. 3. disp. 14. quæst. 3. th. 2. sect. 3.) And since the Church is ignorant who they are to whom God vouchsafes that grace, AND OUGHT TO PRESUME IT IN THE JUDGMENT OF CHARITY OF EVERY ONE BAPTIZED, I ask the Adversaries themselves, with whom Ames is in such great esteem, *what just fault can be found with that prayer in which it gives thanks to God for the regeneration of infants baptized?*"†

And in the same chapter he shows, that the doctrine of the rubric as to the salvation of baptized infants dying in their infancy is that of all the Reformed Churches.

DR. W. FALKNER, 1677.

Dr. Falkner published several works in vindication of the doctrine and rites of our Church, against the Dissenters. They are recommended by (among others) Dr. W. Wotton, in his "Thoughts concerning a Proper Method of Studying Divinity,"‡ and by the late Bishop Cleaver in his "List of Books recommended to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester."§

One of these is entitled, "Libertas Ecclesiastica; or, a Discourse vindicating the lawfulness of those things which are chiefly

---

* Quoniam verò quotquot ad sacras illas epulas ritè dispositi accedunt, ii sacratissimo corpore sanguineque Christi spiritualiter, per fidem scilicet, vescuntur, recte minister, sacra Eucharistia celebrata, Deo gratias agit, quòd omnes communicantes (quanquam de singulis certus non est, nec verò esse potest) cœlesti illo pabulo refecerit. Quidni igitur idem faciat post administratum cuilibet infanti sacrum baptisma? Quidni, inquam, Deo gratias agat pro uniuscujusque regeneratione quem dignatus est Deus ad regenerationis lavacrum admittere? Certe utrobique par ratio est. (pp. 290, 291.)

† Quin ipse etiam Amesius concedit, 'Deum quibusdam, dum baptizantur, habitum vel principium gratiæ infundere.' (Bellarm. Enerv. tom. 3. disp. 14. quæst. 3. th. 2. sect. 3.) Qui verò illi sint, quos Deus ea gratia dignatur, cùm ignoret Ecclesia, DEBEATQUE ID EX JUDICIO CHARITATIS DE QUOLIBET BAPTIZATO PRÆSUMERE, quæro ab ipsis adversariis apud quos tanto in pretio est Amesius, quid jure reprehendi possit *in ea precatione in qua Deo gratias agit ob infantum baptizatorum regenerationem?*" (pp. 296, 297.)

‡ First printed Lond. 1734. 8vo. Reprinted by Dr. H. Cotton, Oxf. 1818. 8vo

§ Oxf. 1791. 8vo.

excepted against in the Church of England;" and from it* I quote the following passages.

Replying to the objections of the Dissenters to the Baptismal Service, he says,—

"I suppose it evident, that if it can be certainly proved, that every baptized infant is *savingly* regenerated, or if on the other side all the expressions in the Liturgy can be fairly and probably interpreted of a *federal* regeneration, *which is generally acknowledged*, there can be then no doubt but all these expressions may be fitly and allowably used. I shall treat of both these senses, because THEY BOTH PLEAD AN ALLOWANCE IN OUR CHURCH."†

He then proceeds to give the arguments for supposing that every baptized infant is savingly regenerated, where, however, he commences with the remark that such regeneration is *very different from that of an adult*. He says,—

"It must be here noted, that by the saving regeneration of baptized infants, it is not intended that their understandings or wills are guided to an high esteem and love of God and the Christian life, which the infant state is not capable of: but this regeneration is *mainly relative*, so that being regenerated by Baptism, they are no longer the children of wrath, and under the curse due to original sin; but are brought into a new state, to be members of the body of Christ, and thereby partakers of the favour of God. And though some small seeds of gracious disposition MAY BE in infants, who are capable thereof in the same manner as they are of corruption; yet *that regeneration or renovation of an infant in Baptism, whereby he is received into a state of remission and salvation, is very different from the regeneration of an adult person, whereby his soul and life are moulded according to the form of the Christian doctrine, and brought into a conformity to the image of God.*"‡

"*To persevere in the Infant-regeneration which is chiefly relative, is no sufficient qualification for the acceptance of the adult, in whom* ANOTHER KIND OF REGENERATION *(by inward real conversion and gracious qualifications and exercises) is necessary.*"§

So that the highest view which he conceived could be taken with respect to the regeneration of infants spoken of in the Baptismal Service, fell far short of what our modern "High Churchmen" tell us is the only view honestly tenable. He had no idea

* 3d. ed. 1677. 8vo.
† p. 229.
‡ Ib. pp. 231, 232
§ Ib. p. 255

of an adult being said to be regenerate, because he might have been, in a sense, justly called so as an infant. His "saving regeneration" of an infant, was not that "Spiritual regeneration" by which a new principle of life is implanted in the soul, producing the sanctification of the recipient.

Proceeding then to treat of the other sense, namely, a "federal regeneration," he says,—

"There is another notion of Baptismal regeneration to be considered, That baptism doth certainly admit persons into communion with the Church of Christ, and to visible membership with him; and that every baptized person, whether he be adult or infant, hath thereupon such titles belonging to him, that he is to be called 'regenerate, a child of God, a member of Christ,' upon the account of his being then admitted into the Christian Society, and being received by Baptism to the profession of Christianity, and under the Covenant of grace, whereby he is *visibly* such. . . . *This notion as it is extended to infants, as understanding them in this sense to be regenerated in Baptism,* WAS EMBRACED BY SOME IN OUR CHURCH FROM KING EDWARD'S REIGN, *and seemeth probably favoured by some expressions of Bishop* [*Archbishop*] *Whitgift, and is more particularly expressed by Bishop Carleton, and divers others.*"*

"Bishop Carleton declareth himself to this purpose, 'That young children baptized are delivered from original sin we doubt not, and if they die before they come to the practice of actual sins, they shall be saved:' and 'that children baptized are put into the state of salvation, I make no doubt of it, but,' saith he, 'this we must believe ex judicio charitatis.' Which phrase of believing by the judgment of charity (which some have thought improper), is, I conceive, the same with those words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 7: 'Charity believeth all things;' that is, *where there is nothing that can determine us to the contrary, Christian charity requireth us to entertain the most favourable apprehension, and to judge and hope the best.* . . . And they who entertain these apprehensions do acknowledge, that all baptized infants or others are regenerated and justified *Sacramento tenus;* or they are visibly such so far as concerneth their profession, and the application of the means of grace; and they may be affirmed to be such, according to the usual language of the Holy Scriptures concerning Sacraments, and the dispensation of the grace of God.

"And this notion, as it is very true, so it is *made use of and manifestly allowed in our Liturgy*, in the Office 'for them who are

* Ib. pp. 256, 257.

baptized in riper years:' where every person then baptized is said to be 'regenerated and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, to be born again and made an heir of everlasting salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, and to have now by Baptism put on Christ, being made a child of God and of the light.' Yet *it is not hereby intended to be dogmatically declared, that every adult person receiving baptism is thereby in a certain state of salvation,* because true faith and repentance which some such persons may possibly want are in them necessary in order to the spiritual efficacy of the Sacraments, and is so acknowledged by the doctrine of our Church. For as our Articles declare, that 'those who receive baptism rightly, are thereby as by an instrument grafted into the Church, and obtain remission of sins' (Art. 27.); so they also assert concerning Sacraments, that 'in such only who worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect and operation."*

BISHOP BURNET;

Bishop of Salisbury from 1689 *to* 1714.

Bishop Burnet, in his Comment on the 27th Article, thus states the nature and effects of Baptism:—

"The salvation that we Christians have by baptism, is effected by that federation into which we enter, when upon the demands that are made of our renouncing the devil, the world, and the flesh, and of our believing in Christ, and our repentance towards God, we make such answers from a good conscience as agree with the end and design of baptism; then by our thus coming into covenant with God, we are saved in baptism. So that the salvation by baptism is given by reason of the federal compact that is made in it. Now this being made outwardly, according to the rules that are prescribed, that must make the baptism good among men, as to all the outward and visible effects of it. But since it is the 'answer of a good conscience' only that 'saves,' then an answer from a bad conscience, from a hypocritical person, who does not inwardly think or purpose, according to what he professes outwardly, cannot save, but does on the contrary aggravate his damnation. Therefore our Article puts the efficacy of baptism, in order to the forgiveness of our sins, and to our adoption and salvation, *upon the virtue of prayer to God;*

* Ib. pp. 258–260.

that is, *upon those vows and other acts of devotion that accompany them.* So that when the seriousness of the mind accompanies the regularity of the action, then both the outward and inward effects of baptism are attained by it: and we are not only 'baptized into one Body,' but are also 'saved by baptism.' So that upon the whole matter, Baptism is a federal admission into Christianity, in which, on God's part, all the blessings of the Gospel are made over to the baptized; and on the other hand, the person baptized takes on him, by a solemn profession and vow, to observe and adhere to the whole Christian religion. So it is a very natural distinction to say, that the outward effects of baptism follow it as outwardly performed; but that *the inward effects of it follow upon the inward acts.* But this difference is still to be observed between inward acts and outward actions, that when the outward action is rightly performed, the Church must reckon the Baptism good, and never renew it. But if one has been wanting in the inward acts, those may be afterwards renewed, and that want may be made up by repentance."*

And having, in his Comment on the latter part of the Article, proceeded to show the reasons for the Baptism of infants, he makes these remarks,—

"The office for baptizing infants is in the same words with that for persons of riper age; because infants being then in the power of their parents, who are of age, are considered as in them, and as binding themselves by the vows that they make in their name. *Therefore the office carries on* THE SUPPOSITION OF AN INTERNAL REGENERATION; and in that helpless state the infant is offered up and dedicated to God; and provided that when he comes to age he takes those vows on himself, and lives like a person so in covenant with God *then he shall find the full effects of baptism;* and if he dies in that state of incapacity, he being dedicated to God, is certainly accepted of by him; and by being put in the second Adam, all the bad effects of his having descended from the first Adam are quite taken away."†

Here, clearly, the inward effect of Baptism is connected with future faith and repentance; and "*internal regeneration*" is said to be only "*supposed.*"

---

* Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, 5th ed. Lond. 1756. 8vo. pp. 379, 380.

† Ib. p. 383.

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON;

Archbishop of Canterbury from 1691 *to* 1694.

Among the works of Archbishop Tillotson are five Sermons on "the nature of Regeneration and its necessity in order to justification and salvation."* The following few extracts, taken from a multitude of passages of the same kind, will fully show the doctrine maintained in them:—

"*Regeneration is the change of a man's state, from a state of sin to a state of holiness;* which, because it is an entrance upon a new kind or course of life, it is fitly resembled to regeneration, or a new birth; to a new creation, the man being as it were quite changed, or made over again, so as not to be, as to the main purpose and design of his life, the same man he was before."†

"As for others who are visibly reclaimed from a notorious wicked course, in these we likewise frequently see this change gradually made, by strong impressions made upon their minds, most frequently by the word of God; sometimes by his Providence whereby they are convinced of the evil and danger of their course, and awakened to consideration, and melted into sorrow and repentance, and perhaps exercised with great terrors of conscience, till at length by the grace of God they come to a fixed purpose and resolution of forsaking their sins and turning to God, and after many strugglings and conflicts with their lusts, and the strong bias of evil habits, this resolution, assisted by the grace of God, doth effectually prevail, and make a real change both in the temper of their minds, and the course of their lives; *and when this is done, and not before, they are said to be regenerate.*"‡

And when, in another place, he is describing the nature of Baptism, he speaks of it thus,—

"Baptism is a solemn rite appointed by our Saviour for the initiating persons into the Christian religion."§

---

* Vol. 2 of the folio edition. They occur in pp. 324—349 of 5th ed. 1735.

† pp. 341, 342.

‡ Ib. pp. 342, 343.

§ Ib. Serm. 70. p. 452.

ARCHBISHOP SHARP;

Archbishop of York from 1691 *to* 1714.

In one of his sermons he says,—

"As for those that either through the occasion of a bad education, or by the abusing a good one, have engaged themselves in vicious courses, and accordingly, *from the time they came to years of discretion*, have lived in a state of sin and ungodliness; these persons ARE NOT YET IN THE REGENERATE STATE (if we speak *as to the inward spiritual part of it*), and must, if ever they mean to be saved, some time or other *undergo a real change and transformation*, both in their *principles* and their course of living."*

And he adds at the latter part of the sermon a notice of "the marks and signs of regeneration," to enable a man to "discern that he is in a regenerate condition;" and after mentioning several, he concludes,—"the truest mark is that of our Saviour, *The tree is known by its fruits.*"†

This shows that though he speaks of infants as being regenerated by baptism (p. 280), he means, so far as he is speaking of them universally, *only in some qualified sense;* for he maintains, that adults who have not experienced a spiritual renewing of the mind, "are not yet regenerate," though baptized in infancy. And in the commencement of the sermon (which is on Rom. xii. 2, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds") he describes regeneration as consisting of two parts:—

"The being transformed," he says, "by the renewing of our minds, which is here spoken of, though it be commonly understood to be the whole of regeneration, yet it is really but *one part of it*, though indeed it be THE PRINCIPAL PART. For regeneration, or the new birth, consists of two parts, an outward profession of Christ's religion, and an inward sanctification or holiness of heart and life." (p. 279.)

BISHOP JOHN WILLIAMS;

Bishop of Chichester from 1696 *to* 1709.

In his "Brief Exposition of the Church Catechism," we have

* Sermons, vol. 3. serm. 13. p. 294. ed. 1729. 8vo.
† Ib. pp. 299—305.

the following question and answer, in which Baptism and the New Birth are distinctly spoken of as separable.

"Q. Is baptism alone sufficient to salvation?

"A. No; not alone without the *New Birth* thereby signified, unless *we are dead unto sin, and alive unto God through Jesus Christ*. Rom. vi. 3, 4, 11."*

And the words, "made a member of Christ, &c.," he evidently considers as equivalent to being made a member of the visible Church.

WILLIAM BURKITT, 1693; d. 1703.

Mr. Burkitt, Vicar of Dedham, Essex, is the well-known author of a highly esteemed Commentary on the New Testament. Of the work I am about to quote, entitled, "A Help and Guide to Christian Families," first published in 1693, I need only say that it has been for many years on the list of the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." In this work he writes thus:—

"Q. When may you be said to be regenerate?

"A. When (together with a new name conferred upon me in baptism) there is a new nature, by the sanctifying Spirit of God, wrought in me, enabling me to bring forth the fruits of sobriety, righteousness, and godliness, in my daily conversation.

"Q. What occasion is there for such a renovating change to be wrought in you?

"A. Very much; namely, to restore my depraved nature to its primitive integrity. Accordingly, I need the Spirit of God's assistance, in concurrence with my own endeavours, to enlighten my dark understanding, to conquer the rebellion of my will, to rectify the disorders of my affections, to subdue the violence of my unruly passions and appetites, and to reduce those rebellious powers under the government and dominion of reason and religion.

"Q. Why is such a regenerating change absolutely necessary?

"A. In order to our being made partakers of the benefits of the covenant of grace, as also to qualify us for, and entitle us to the

* 15th ed. Lond. 1701. 8vo. p. 58. Camb. Univ. Lib. C. xii. 17.

kingdom of glory; for 'except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' (John iii. 3.)

* * * * * * *

"Q. What is baptism?

"A. An holy institution of Christ, for the benefit of believers and their seed, wherein, by washing with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is signified the inward purification of the soul by the blood and Spirit of Christ.

* * * * * * *

"Q. Is baptism in infancy to be reiterated and repeated when a person comes to riper years?

"A. By no means; this being the Sacrament of our initiation, or entrance into the visible Church, is, and ought to be, but once performed.

"Q. Who are to be baptized?

"A. Not only believers, but their infant offspring, who are taken into covenant with God, together with themselves. Gen. xvii. 7, 10."*

DR. THOMAS BRAY, 1699; d. 1730.

Dr. Bray was the well-known and respected founder of the Society still called, "The Associates of Dr. Bray," which from the first has always received the highest Ecclesiastical sanction in our Church. About 1696, he published a Course of Lectures on the Catechism, of which his biographer says,—

"It was esteemed by many of the first distinction in the Church as the most accurate performance extant on the subject; and was dedicated to that very learned prelate, Bishop Lloyd, by whose persuasion it was published, and of whose favour and esteem Mr. Bray had a more than ordinary share."†

The third edition of this work appeared in 1699,‡ and from it I take the following extracts.

---

* Pp. 192—210 of the edition printed Lond. Whittaker, 1824. 12mo.

† Life and Designs of the Rev. Dr. Bray. 2nd ed. Lond. 1808. 8vo. p. 4.

‡ A Course of Lectures upon the Church Catechism, in four volumes. Vol. 1. 3d ed. By T. Bray, D.D. Amsterdam, 1699. 8vo. The title of this edition differs from those of the two preceding editions, and the work is much enlarged. Dr. Bray was in Holland part of the year 1699, which accounts for the place where it was printed. The other vols. were never published.

In Lecture VI., on "The Privileges of being Members of Christ's Church," he says,—

"All these forementioned privileges do belong to the members of Christ's Church, to such as have been baptized and professed themselves to be Christians. To understand which rights and privileges the better, you must know, that as there are 'two sorts of members in the visible Church, so there are two kinds of privileges that belong to each sort,' as one rightly states this matter, 'each having those privileges, which are proper and peculiar to them, according to the relation they bear to the Head and their fellow-members.'

"First, 'There are members only by fœderal or covenant holiness, such as are *only born of water*, when, by baptism, they are united to Christ and the Church, and take upon them the profession and practice of the Christian religion. Now the privileges that do belong to these are of the same make with their Church-membership, *outward*, and consist only in outward and public communion with the Church in word and ordinances.'

"Secondly, 'There are members by real and inherent holiness, such as are *not only born of water, but of the Spirit also*, when by the inward operation of the Holy Ghost their souls are renewed after the image of God, and made partakers of a divine nature. And the privileges that do belong to these are not only the forementioned ones, but together with them, others that are suitable to their more spiritual relations inward," &c. (p. 77.)

Again, in Lect. vii., on the meaning of the phrase "child of God," in the Catechism, he writes thus,—

"There are those who are the children of God by *spiritual regeneration*, by being renewed in the spirit of their minds, and by being created anew in righteousness and true holiness. . . . They are such, who are *born, not only of water, but also of the Spirit, that is, who have not only been baptized into the Christian Church, but have been sanctified by the Holy Spirit*, and have their whole natures and dispositions so altered for the better, that from vicious and ungodly, they are changed to virtuous and holy dispositions and inclinations. And such a vast change wrought in our natures by the Word and Spirit of God, may very justly give those who enjoy it the title of the children of God. . . . But then all who are the children of God, either in the sense of Scripture, or of your Catechism, are *not actually thus regenerate*. As to the sense of Scripture, it is plain. . . . And as to the meaning of a child of God here in your Catechism, it is also plain that it is not only such as are renewed in the spirit of their

minds and do imitate God, that are there to be understood; for every one who is catechized is required to answer, that 'in his baptism he was made a child of God,' whereas many catechumens are not actually as yet renewed and really converted, and by their own fault many will never be; so that *a child of God by spiritual regeneration* and a godlike imitation, *expresses rather the duty of every one, what he ought to be, than the notion and nature of a privilege,* which many may enjoy, who in the mean time are not over dutiful. So that *a child of God by spiritual regeneration,* or a Godlike imitation, *is a meaning of the word as much too narrow to be the sense of it here in your Catechism,* as a child by creation was too wide." (pp. 88—90.)

BISHOP THOMAS WILSON;

Bishop of Sodor and Man from 1697 *to* 1755.

The following passages are from this Apostolic Bishop's "Maxims of Piety and of Christianity;" a work circulated by the "Society for promoting Christian Knowledge."

"A regenerate person cannot sin. (1 John iii. 9.)

"That is, he has by faith and the grace of God got such an habit of holiness, such an inclination to virtue, that he cannot, upon any temptation, knowingly consent to transgress the laws of God. Having overcome the world, that is, all those temptations by which men are led to commit sin, he is dead to sin; that is, he can no more sin deliberately, than a dead man can breathe.

"Regeneration.

"*The only certain proof of regeneration is victory.* 'He that is born of God overcometh the world.' (1 John v. 4.) When we live by faith; when faith has subdued the will, hath wrought repentance not to be repented of, (2 Cor. vii. 10) hath conquered our corruptions; then, to him that overcometh, will God give to eat of the tree of life."*

BISHOP WILLIAM BEVERIDGE;

Bishop of St. Asaph from 1704 *to* 1708.

Bishop Beveridge is often quoted as an advocate of the doc-

* Works, Bath. 1796. 8vo. vol. 4. p. 278.

trine that spiritual regeneration, in the full sense of the phrase, is invariably bestowed in Baptism. We have seen, however, ample reason to be cautious how we allow an author's doctrine to be determined by a few passages taken apart from his other statements on the same subject. There is no other point of doctrine on which this caution is so necessary, as that under our consideration in these pages. And we shall find that Bishop Beveridge's works, as a whole, entirely negative such a view.

Thus, his defence, in his Commentary on the Articles, of the word regeneration, as connected with baptism, is quoted as if it meant that regeneration was always conferred in Baptism, whereas in the context we read,—

"In baptism our faith is confirmed, and grace increased, not by virtue of the water itself, but *by virtue of prayer*, whereby God is prevailed with to purify our souls by his Spirit, as our bodies are washed with the water."*

And at the end of his remarks he says,—

"We must pray for God's presence in the Sacrament; for without that we can receive no blessing from it; but with that there is no blessing but we may have in it."†

And in the same place, we may observe, he expressly limits the right of infants to baptism to the children of *believers*, on account of baptism being the *seal* of the covenant. He says,—

"Seeing all disciples are to be baptized, infants, the children of believing parents, amongst the rest, must be baptized too; for that they are disciples is clear, from their being circumcised under the Law: for that *argued they were in covenant with God, otherwise they could not have had the seal of the covenant administered to them;* and if they were in covenant with God, they must needs be disciples; to be a disciple, and to be in covenant with God, being one and the same thing. So that all that are in covenant with God are his disciples; and all that are his disciples are in covenant with him. And again, of children our Saviour saith, 'Of such is the kingdom of God.' Mark x. 14. And therefore they must needs be disciples, unless such as are not disciples should be thought to belong unto the kingdom of God. But I need not insist any longer upon this, to

* Discourse upon the XXXIX Articles. Oxf. 1846. 8vo. p. 456.
† Ib. p. 459.

prove little children to be disciples, *if their parents be.* For so long as children, they are looked upon as parts of their parents, and therefore what their parents are they must needs be; if their parents be heathens, the children are heathens: *if their parents be Christians, the children are Christians too.*"*

So in his Exposition of the Church Catechism, it would be easy to quote passages which would seem to imply that spiritual regeneration always accompanied Baptism; but the passages obviously prove too much when so interpreted, because they would show that all *adults* are necessarily regenerated in baptism, and therefore they must be received as applying to those cases in which baptism works its full end and purpose, whether in respect to adults or infants. In this very Exposition he says,—

"When a person is to be baptized, he is first asked in the name of God, and in the presence of the congregation, as witnesses of it, whether he doth renounce, and will forsake, all manner of sins? To which he answereth, 'I renounce them all.' *And if he makes this answer heartily, sincerely, and with a good conscience,* SO AS AFTERWARDS TO PERFORM WHAT HE THEN PROMISED, *he partakes of the grace signified in this Sacrament, and is certainly saved by it.*"†

And commenting on the question, "Why then are infants baptized," &c., he says,—

"The reason is, Not only because they have the seeds of repentance and faith in them, which may afterwards grow up to perfection; but *chiefly, because they then 'promise to perform them':* which is as much as we know adult persons or those of riper years do. They only profess and promise to repent and believe: *but whether they really do so,* OR EVER WILL, *is known only to God.* SO *infants make the same profession and promise,* though not in their own persons, yet by their sureties or guardians, which do it in their name and stead. And when they come to age, they are as much bound to perform what they so promised, as if they had done it themselves, in their own person."‡

From this it would appear, that he held that in the case of infants, there was a similar condition to that required for adults.

* Ib. pp. 462, 463.

† The Church Catechism explained. 4th ed. Lond. 1709. 12mo. pp. 128, 129.

‡ Ib. pp. 129, 130.

Again, in his Sermons, he thus expresses his views :—

"We may here observe, that the saints and servants of the most High God, such as Peter was, are begotten again of him . . . . . How this wonderful work is effected, is past our reach to apprehend ; we know not, how we were formed at first, much less how we are born again; only in general we may observe, that all men that proceed naturally from the first Adam are conceived and born in sin, their nature is corrupted and depraved, so that they are prone of themselves to do evil, and unable to do anything that is truly good ; *but* WHEN A MAN BELIEVES IN CHRIST THE SECOND ADAM, *and so is made a member of his Body, he is quickened and animated by his Spirit, which being the principle of a new life in him, he thereby becomes a new creature, another kind of creature from what he was before, and therefore is properly said to be born again,* 'not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' John i. 13."*

"The new man or new creature is acted and governed by the Spirit of God himself, which is infinite ; and whereas *other men are born only of the flesh, such a one is regenerate, or born again of the Spirit ;* and so there is the same difference between him and them, as there is between spirit and flesh, according to that remarkable saying of our blessed Saviour, 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' John iii. 6. For everything being of the same nature with that from whence it proceeds, as they who are born (as all men by nature are) of the flesh are carnal and sensual, so they are carnal and sensual like the flesh they are born of ; so they who are born again, being then born of the Holy Spirit of God, are thereby made holy and spiritual, of the same nature with him from whom they receive their new birth."†

"He [Christ] having suffered death for our sins, and being raised again from the dead, was exalted to the right hand of God, and made the mediator between him and us ; by virtue of which mediation he sends down his Holy Spirit upon *all that believe in him, to regenerate or beget them again, and make them the children of God :* and so it is written, 'as many as receive him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.' John i. 12. He gives them this power by giving them his Holy Spirit to accomplish this great work in them ; that as he is the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his essence from all eternity, so *they who believe in him* may be begotten again of God, and so made his children by adoption

---

* Works. 1720. 2 vols. fol. or 2d ed. 1729. Serm. 73. Vol. 1. p 699.
† Ib. p. 610. ‡ Ib. p. 611.

and grace, which he could not have done, if he had not been raised from the dead.'*

Again, in a Sermon on John i. 12, entitled, "Faith in Christ our title to the privilege of Sonship," he writes thus:—

"What it is properly to be the sons of God, is the next thing to be considered. And we need not go far for the understanding of it, having it explained in the words following my text; where these sons of God are said to be 'born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God'; that is, they are the sons of God, not in a carnal but spiritual sense; not as they were born of their natural parents, but as being born again of God himself: born, not properly begotten; for that is peculiar to Christ, who is therefore called the only-begotten of the Father, and is never said to be born, but only begotten of him: whereas others are said to be born of him, not by eternal generation, as Christ was, and none but he ever was, or can be, from the Essence of his Father, but *by spiritual regeneration, through the mighty power and efficacy of the Holy Ghost, renewing the spirit of their minds, and so infusing into them a principle of new life, whereby they become new creatures, and have the image of God enstamped again upon them, so as to be partakers of his divine nature, and holy in their capacities as he is holy.* . . . But here we must observe *the condition* upon which Christ gives those who received this power or privilege to become the sons of God, even *because they believe in his name;* for so the words in the original plainly import, and may be thus rendered; 'But as many as received him, to them, as believing in his name, he gave power to become the sons of God.' So that it is *upon the account of their believing in him,* that he is pleased to confer this honour upon them. And so indeed by the Gospel tenure, all our right and title to the great blessings which Christ hath purchased for mankind, is founded upon *our believing in him.* It is *by that our sins are pardoned, our persons justified, and our souls saved.* . . . . And *so particularly our being* REGENERATE, or made the sons of God, that, as I have observed, is wrought in us, and for us, by the Spirit of God; *but that is given only to those who believe in Christ.* . . . . Hence it is, that as St. John expressly tells us, 'Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God,' 1 John v. 1. because *by his believing in Jesus Christ, he receives the Spirit of God, whereby he is regenerate, and born again of him.* And to the same purpose St. Paul saith, 'Ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ.' Gal. iii. 26. From

* Ib. p. 611.

whence it is manifest, that as we are made the children of God only by Christ, we are made so by him, only upon *our believing in him.*"*

Now, there is no meaning in words, if these passages do not signify, that no man is a spiritually regenerate person who has not been made so through a true and living faith. However, then, the Bishop may in other places appear to connect the spiritual birth with Baptism (and I grant that such passages are to be found), here are his own words to balance such statements; and whatever we may determine his precise view to have been,† the above passages are, to a certain extent, clear and decisive.

JOSEPH BINGHAM, 1706—1722; d. 1723.

Mr. Bingham, in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," has given us an account of the names applied to Baptism by the Fathers. These names we sometimes hear quoted as showing what Baptism works, wherever it is administered. In fact, the names applied to Baptism, and the descriptions given of its effects, seem to be the principal arguments producible for the notion I am here opposing of spiritual regeneration being always conferred by it. Such phrases, however, (as I have already remarked) can prove nothing as to its effects in particular cases, because it is admitted, that *adults* do not universally receive the full baptismal blessing, and therefore these phrases must be understood conditionally. It may be well, however, to point out that our learned Bingham, when enumerating these names, remarks more than once, that such titles are only descriptive of what Baptism works in the case of *worthy* recipients.

Thus, speaking of its being called "Indulgence," or, "Absolution," he says,—

"Whenever the ancients call baptism by the name of 'Absolu-

* Serm. 81. Vol. 2, pp. 32—34.

† Probably we should not be far wrong in considering his view to have been much like that of Dr. Jackson and others, distinguishing between an *infantine* and an *adult* regeneration; and holding that though the expressions "regenerated" and "born of the Spirit," might properly be, in a sense, applied to baptized infants, yet that this regeneration was not that spiritual regeneration spoken of in Scripture as necessary for adults.

tion,' or 'Indulgence,' they are to be understood with this limitation, that it is so only to those who are worthy receivers of it."*

Again, speaking of other titles,—

"Such honourable titles and appellations did the ancients give to this Sacrament of Baptism, taken from the noble effects which it was supposed to confer on all those who were *worthy partakers of it.*"†

"Another sort of names given to Baptism, were taken from the conditions required of all those that received it, which were the profession of a true faith and a sincere repentance. . . . Whence we may observe, what the ancients mean, when they speak of penance and absolution, or remission of sins, as a Sacrament. For they themselves explain their own meaning to be baptism, which is a Sacrament requiring repentance as a condition, and granting absolution as an effect and privilege to all *worthy receivers.*"‡

But in his work entitled, "The French Church's Apology for the Church of England," he makes some remarks still more pertinent to our present subject. One of the chapters of that work is devoted to the defence of the rubric of our Church as to the salvation of baptized infants dying in their infancy, against the censures of Mr. Baxter. And he there tells us, that as to the effect of Baptism in infants, "The Church of England," and "the French and other Reformed Churches,"

"All speak and mean the same thing, which is no more than this that all children who have a just right to baptism, *and are truly qualified for it*, and are lawfully and duly baptized, are thereby put into *a salvable condition*, in which if they die without committing actual sin, they will certainly be saved."§

Now certainly if our Church speaks and means the same thing with the French, (in which, as Bingham adds, every minister at that time subscribed and swore to believe and maintain the decrees of the Synod of Dort,) and other Reformed Churches, there can be no doubt that she does not hold that *every* child is spiritually regenerated in Baptism.

And he goes on to say, that the rubric "speaks only of the children of believers, who have a right to baptism, and *no*

* Book. xi. c. 1. § 2. Works, ed. 1843. vol. iii. p. 401.
† Ib. § 5. p. 405.
‡ Ib. § 8. p. 410.
§ Bk. iii. c. 18. Works, vol. 9. p. 168.

others;" and shows that the doctrine of the rubric, so understood, was the doctrine of Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, and the French National Synod held at Charenton in 1623.*

BISHOP BRADFORD;

Bishop of Carlisle from 1718 *to* 1723; *and of Rochester from* 1723 *to* 1731.

Bishop Bradford, when Rector of St. Mary-le-Bow, previous to his being raised to the Episcopal office, published a little treatise entitled, "A Discourse concerning *Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration,*" which was adopted by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge as one of their tracts; and has remained for more than a century on their list of books, the seventh edition being published by them in 1810, with the following "Advertisement" appended to it. "This seventh edition is published at a time, when it is hoped that so judicious and scriptural a discourse may be of service to settle the minds of good Christians, in some present disputes concerning baptismal and spiritual regeneration."

The discourse is on the text, Tit. iii. 4—7, particularly on the words, "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," in verse 5. And having pointed out, that "the washing of regeneration" signifies baptism, by which they are "regenerated into *a new state*" by admission into the Church, and that the "renewing of the Holy Ghost" is "what in the Prophet Ezekiel is represented by God's 'giving to men a new heart and a new spirit,'" &c., and "what our Lord himself means in his discourse with Nicodemus by 'being born of the Spirit;'" he proceeds, in his fourth division, to show,—

"*That the washing of regeneration may be separated from the renewing of the Holy Ghost;* and that if it be so, the end for which it is used, namely, our salvation, cannot be obtained, the latter being absolutely necessary in order to our being saved in the complete sense of that word."†

* Ib. pp. 168, 169.

† Christian Knowl. Soc. ed. of 1826, p. 25.

And upon this head he remarks,—

"It is the way of the Scriptures to speak to and of the visible members of the Church of Christ, under such appellations and expressions as may seem at first hearing to imply, that they are all of them truly righteous and holy persons. Thus the Apostles style those to whom they write, in general, 'saints;' speak of them as 'sanctified in Christ Jesus, chosen of God, buried with Christ in baptism, risen again with him from the dead, sitting with him in heavenly places:' and particularly St. Paul in my text says, 'they were saved by the washing of regeneration,' &c. The reason of which is, that they were visibly by obligation and by profession all this; which was thus represented to them, the more effectually to stir them up and engage them to live according to their profession and obligation. But yet it is too evident, from divers passages in their writings, and experience has confirmed to us the same thing, that both in their times, and ever since, there have been many who have enjoyed 'the washing of regeneration,' whose tempers and manners have demonstrated that they were not also 'renewed by the Holy Ghost.' . . . . I take it for granted that I need not insist upon any proof of this matter; but only further observe that *Baptismal regeneration*, when separated from the renewing of the Holy Ghost, must necessarily be ineffectual to the salvation of men's souls. St. Paul in my text joins them together, as concurring in the work of our salvation; and our Saviour, in the place before cited, makes the being 'born of the Spirit,' as well as of 'water,' necessary to 'the entering into the kingdom of God.' St. Peter in like manner, where he mentions baptism as saving us, adds, to prevent all mistake, 'not the putting away the filth of the flesh, (not that merely,) but the answer of a good conscience towards God,' 1 Pet. iii. 21. that also is necessary to salvation; namely, when the baptized person's heart, and consequently his life, agree with his profession and obligation. What St. Paul says of the Jews, may be repeated with respect to Christians also, with a little variation of the words; 'He is not a Christian, which is one outwardly; neither is that regeneration (namely, such as will be effectual to salvation) which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Christian which is one inwardly: and regeneration is that of the heart, in the Spirit, and not in the letter: whose praise is not of men but of God. Rom. ii. 28 29."*

And his last head is,—

"To inquire how those persons, who have had 'the washing of

* Ib. pp. 25—27.

regeneration,' but are not yet 'renewed by the Holy Ghost,' may attain to this renovation."*

HENRY STEBBING, 1722; d. 1763.

Chancellor of Salisbury.

Mr. Stebbing published in 1722 "Discourses upon several Subjects," of which the first is on "Regeneration, or the New-birth." This discourse is partly an abridgment of some remarks of the excellent Dr. Clagett, so that we see in it the view of both these divines. The discourses are dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The following passages will show the views inculcated in this work.

"There will be little room to doubt what is meant by being regenerate, when we have seen how our Saviour himself has explained that phrase. After having told Nicodemus, John iii. 3. that 'except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,' he adds, ver. 5. 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' This latter verse, you see, sets forth the particulars of that new-birth which in the former our Saviour had spoken of under general terms. So that if these particulars do constitute the whole of what is meant by being a true disciple of Jesus Christ, and no more; it will follow (Christ himself being his own interpreter) that to be regenerate signifies no more than being a true disciple of Jesus Christ. And that this is the truth of the case, I shall now endeavour to make appear, by shewing, First, that to be 'born of water' signifies the being received or admitted as proselytes to Christ by baptism. And, Secondly, That to be 'born of the Spirit' DENOTES THAT LOVE AND SUBMISSION TO CHRIST WROUGHT IN US BY THE SPIRIT, WHICH LEADS TO OBEDIENCE TO ALL HIS COMMANDMENTS."†

"To be 'born of God,' or to be 'born of the Spirit,' denotes such a faith in Jesus Christ, as begets a conformity of mind to his laws and commandments; which will appear yet further from the words of St. Paul, Gal. vi. 15. 'In Christ Jesus,' says he, 'neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a *new creature*.' . . .

---

* Ib. p. 29.

† Discourses upon several subjects, p. 4. in Polemical Tracts by H. Stebbing. Cambr. 1727. fol.

Who sees not here that this new creature, this *spiritual birth*, is *equivalent to that faith which worketh by love to the keeping the commandments of God?*"*

"You see now what is the true and full import of being regenerate or born again; viz., That it implies, 1. *A state of proselytism to Christ by baptism;* and 2. A state of conformity to his doctrine and precepts, which is that which our baptism engages us to. Now though this is the only *complete and adequate* notion of regeneration, yet you cannot but have observed in going along, that to be regenerate, and those other phrases equivalent to it, are frequently used in a more confined sense, and have a peculiar, or at least a more principal relation, sometimes to the one of the above-mentioned particulars, and sometimes to the other. In the texts cited in the foregoing paragraph, to be 'born of God,' and to be 'a new creature,' do certainly denote that submission or subjection to the will of Christ, which the Spirit works in the heart of every true disciple. For this is that, and that only, which both enables us to 'overcome the world,' and makes it impossible for us (so long as it lasts) to be overcome by it. But when St. Paul speaks of the 'Laver of regeneration,' Tit. iii. 5., there the word 'regeneration' peculiarly signifies that state which we are admitted to by our baptism; i. e. *the state of proselytism or discipleship*, which is here *expressly distinguished from the* ανακαινωσις Πνευματος ἁγιου, *the 'renewing of the Holy Ghost,' or that inward change of mind which leads us to obedience.*"†

And observing that the remarks he had been making respecting regeneration, applied more particularly to the case of adults, he adds,—

"It is under this view that it is most commonly treated of in Scripture. The first preachers of the Gospel were principally concerned with those who were to be brought over from Judaism, or Heathenism, to the faith of the Gospel. When therefore they speak of regeneration, *they speak of it generally as it relates to such.* But there is *a sense* of regeneration, in which it is common to all baptized persons, infants as well as adult; as well as a sense in which it is peculiar to the adult only. The adult only can be said to be regenerate, as that word implies under it a change of mind from evil to good, or a conformity of the will and affections to the commandments of Christ. But the word regenerate (as has been shown) is in Scripture sometimes used to denote *that relative state which a man stands in towards God as the disciple of Jesus Christ:* and conse-

* Ib. p. 5. † Ib. p. 6.

quently, THUS FAR, OR IN THIS SENSE, every disciple of Jesus Christ, i. e. every person who has been received as a member of Christ's Church *by baptism*, is regenerate."*

Here the regeneration attributed to baptism is clearly confined to the notion of an introduction into the visible Church, which of course is in all cases the effect of baptism.

THOMAS STACKHOUSE,

Vicar of Beenham, Berks; died 1752.

This "learned and laborious divine," as Chalmers calls him, was the author of several well known works of good repute, and much esteemed, both in their day and since; particularly his "History of the Bible." Among other works, he published a "Body of Divinity" in folio, in 1729, which passed through four editions in the course of a few years.

In this work, regarding baptism as "the instrument of making men members of Christ's visible Body,"† he thus speaks on the subject of Regeneration:—

"From what has been said on this subject, thus far pursued, we may plainly perceive, that regeneration is that change and alteration in a man, whereby his nature, which is corrupted by sin, is sanctified and purified; whereby his iniquities are purged away; and he, by God's Spirit, endued with true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. And we come now to show the absolute necessity of it, in order to our future happiness. St. Paul, speaking of some who desired to make a fair shew in the flesh, and constrained others to be circumcised, tells us expressly, that in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. Circumcision, we know, was an ordinance of God's own institution, the seal of the covenant between him and his people, a mark of distinction between them and other nations, and a symbol of inward purity, or sanctity of mind; and yet the Apostle tells those that held themselves obliged to the observation of it, that all its supposed privileges and prerogatives, without a renovation of their nature, availed nothing. And by parity of reason, he must be interpreted to say to us, that *our*

* Ib. pp. 12, 13.

† 2d ed. Lond. 1734. fol. p. 721.

sacramental washing in baptism, our spiritual gifts and endowments, our profound knowledge and learning, our observation of the ordinances of Christ, and our outward acts of religious worship, will all *avail us nothing*, unless we have A NEW PRINCIPLE *implanted in us, such as influences our lives and produces evangelical obedience.*"*

And he then proceeds to point out the "difference between the regenerate and unregenerate," that we may know "whether we are regenerate or no;" and closes with the remark,—

"If ye experimentally find, that the grace of God's Holy Spirit has *begun the work of regeneration* in your souls, has renewed your mind, and tamed your passions, and changed your lives, rejoice and be exceeding glad, because your renovation, being thus happily commenced, is a good pledge and reason to hope, that your names shall be written in the Book of Life."†

ARCHBISHOP SECKER;

Bishop of Bristol from 1734 *to* 1737; *of Oxford from* 1737 *to* 1758;—*Archbishop of Canterbury from* 1758 *to* 1768.

The following extracts are from the Archbishop's Lectures on the Catechism.

Speaking of the promises made for the infant, he says,—

"If Baptism had been administered to children, without anything said to express its meaning, it would have had too much the appearance of an insignificant ceremony or a superstitious charm. And if only the privileges, to which it intitled, had been rehearsed; *they might seem annexed to it absolutely, without any conditions to be observed on the children's part. It was therefore needful to express the conditions also.* Now it would naturally appear the strongest and liveliest way of expressing them, to represent the infant as promising by others then, what he was to promise by and for himself, as soon as he could. So the Form, used already for persons grown up, was applied, with a few changes, to children also. And though, by such application, some words and phrases must appear a little strange, if they were strictly interpreted; yet the intention of them was and is understood to be a very proper one; declaring in the fullest manner what the child is to do hereafter, by a figure and representation made of it at present."‡

* Ib. pp. 969, 970. † Ib. pp. 970, 971.

‡ Abp. Secker's Lectures on the Catechism. 3d ed. Lond. 1771. 8vo. p. 26.

Here the enjoyment of the full baptismal blessing, even in the case of infants, is expressly made to depend on the performance of the conditions.

Again, in the latter part of his Lectures, speaking to the same point, after having observed,—

"Indeed the mere outward act of being baptized is, as St. Peter, in the words already mentioned, very truly expresses it, the mere 'putting away of the filth of the flesh;' unless it be made effectual to save us, as he teaches, in the same place, it must, by 'the answer of a good conscience towards God:' that is, by the sincere stipulation and engagement of 'repentance whereby we forsake sin, and faith, whereby we believe the promises of God made to us in that sacrament:'"—

he adds, respecting the case of children, that although they cannot exercise repentance and faith, yet,—

"In the mean time baptism may very fitly be administered; because God, on his part, can certainly express by it, both his removing, at present, the disadvantages which they lie under by the sin of Adam: and his removing hereafter, *on proper conditions*, the disadvantages which they may come to lie under by their own sins. And though they cannot, on their parts, expressly promise to perform these conditions, yet they are not only bound to perform them, whether they promise it or not; but (which is the point our Catechism insists on) their sureties promise for them, that they shall be made sensible, as soon as may be, that they are so bound; and ratify the engagement in their own persons: WHICH WHEN THEY DO, IT THEN BECOMES COMPLETE. *For it is by no means necessary, that a covenant should be executed, by both the parties to it, at just* THE SAME TIME: and as the Christian Covenant is one of the greatest equity and favour, we cannot doubt, to speak in the language of our Liturgy, 'but that God favourably alloweth the charitable work of bringing infants to his holy baptism.' For the promise of the Covenant being expressly said to belong to us and to our children, without any limitation of age; why should they not all, since they are to partake of the promise, partake also of *the sign of it*?' especially since the infants of the Jews were, by a solemn sign, entered into their Covenant: and the infants of proselytes to the Jews by *this very sign*, amongst others, *of baptism*?"*

"To the only valuable purpose of God's favour and eternal happiness, he is not a Christian, which is one outwardly; neither is that Baptism which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Christian, which

* Ib. p. 295–297.

is one inwardly; and baptism is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God. (Rom. ii. 28, 29.)"*

BISHOP EDMUND LAW;

Bishop of Carlisle from 1779 *to* 1787.

The following extracts are from a tract of Bishop Law's, entitled, "A Dissertation on the nature and necessity of Catechising," which was for many years circulated by the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." I quote from an edition printed by the Society in 1803.

"These foundations [i. e. of religion] are laid when we *commence Christians*, and this we do, properly, *when in our own persons we engage to perform our part of the baptismal covenant*. . . . I have therefore placed the commencement of Christianity, not so much in any dedication of us, or stipulation for us, in our infancy, as in our actual entrance on the Christian life; when the religion of Christ begins in some degree to affect our understanding and direct our conscience; when it becomes our own choice rather than the effect of chance, of the constitution, or custom, of the country wherein we were born: which with the generality in our Church is to be dated from their *Confirmation*. What efficacy the administration of baptism may have upon those who die before they come to the use of reason, or what necessity there is for the administering it to such, are questions which I do not meddle with at present; but only beg leave to observe, that in what circumstances soever this rite is administered, in order to make it a reasonable service, such an Office as that of Confirmation seems very fit to follow, and a good deal of instruction should attend them both as closely as possible. For *that* Baptism, which has an effect on our salvation, must have it, as the Apostle (1 Pet. iii. 24) plainly shows us, not in itself, by virtue of the external act and as depending on any certain person, matter, or form, or as operating like a charm; but in a moral intellectual manner, and so as to affect the heart, and influence the temper. It is 'not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.' For it includes a solemn contract between God and us, whereby we engage to devote ourselves to Christ, and to become his true disciples. Upon our performing which engagement, God promises to forgive us our

† Ib. p. 298.

offences, and bring us to eternal life; and consequently it implies a sincere conscientious declaration of our faith and resolution, as to those several articles of belief and practice, concerning which we are there properly interrogated. Now, as something like this is supposed to be done for us in our infancy, and, of course, all is transacted in our stead by proxy, the subsequent rite of Confirmation comes in very properly to supply the unavoidable defects of such a transaction, to constitute this primary religious Office of a piece with all the rest, and to make it, what each one's religion ought to be, a *personal* thing, *to render us complete members of the Christian Church*, and to fulfil the general institution which our Lord has left for making his disciples." (pp. 4—6.)

"The reply given to the 2nd and 3rd questions in our Catechism will admit almost as many queries to unfold it as it contains principal words. Nor should the privileges, immediately annexed to Baptism in the former, ever be recited without carefully inculcating those duties mentioned in the latter, *as conditionally implied in it, or strictly connected with it, and* WITHOUT WHICH IT IS AN EMBLEM OF REGENERATION RATHER THAN THE THING ITSELF." (pp. 13, 14.)

BISHOP SAMUEL HORSLEY;

Bishop of St. David's from 1788 *to* 1793; *of Rochester from* 1793 *to* 1802; *and of St. Asaph from* 1802 *to* 1806.

"The connection is necessary and constant between a good life and a *regenerate* mind; and where there is a conscience void of offence, there is the sanctifying Spirit of the Lord."*

"We have the express declaration of Him who sends the Spirit into the hearts of his disciples, that its operation is no otherwise to be perceived than in its effects."†

"Conscience attesting that the life is innocent and the heart sincere, Faith draws the conclusion that this upright heart and blameless conduct is the work of the Holy Spirit of God. And thus, in the sensible effect of a reformed life and *regenerate* mind, it discovers a token of God's present favour."‡

---

* Serm. on Eph. iv. 30. Among his "Nine Sermons on the Resurrection and other subjects." Quoted from the edition of his Sermons in 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1829. See vol. 2. p. 431.

† Ib

‡ Ib p. 453

BISHOP SHUTE BARRINGTON;

Bishop of Llandaff from 1769 *to* 1782; *of Salisbury from* 1781 *to* 1791; *of Durham from* 1791 *to* 1826.

In a Charge delivered to his Clergy at Durham in 1801, Bishop Barrington thus expresses himself.

"To the *regenerate* Christian, to the '*new man*,' 'created in Christ Jesus to good works,' 'created after God in righteousness and true holiness,' the yoke of Christ is certainly easy, and his burden light; but to the corrupt passions of mere animal nature, to the selfish inclinations of the 'old man,' nothing can be more irksome and painful."*

"It is true, indeed, that whom God is willing to justify, he sanctifies; and he sanctifies whom he will; 'for he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy; and whom he will, he hardeneth'; that is, he leaves the sinner to the natural corruption of his own heart, and the unsubdued power of sin. The sinner who is thus left, continues in an unrewarded [*? misprint for*, unrenewed], *unregenerate* and unsanctified, that is, in a reprobate and lost state."†

"*In a state of sincere repentance and true faith the mind has acquired that newness of spirit, and rectitude of heart, which* CONSTITUTES THE NEW BIRTH, and is the source of every spiritual comfort here, and all our hopes hereafter."‡

Such are a few out of the mass of testimonies that might be produced from our more modern divines against the doctrine, that spiritual regeneration, in the proper sense of the words, invariably accompanies Baptism when that rite is administered to infants. And certainly not more than two of those from whom the extracts are given—Bishop Hopkins and Dean Durel—had any tendency to "Calvinistic" views. The clear declarations of Holy Scripture as to the indispensable *characteristics* of those who are "born again" by the Spirit, have convinced the great majority of our divines (whatever might be the

---

* Sermons, Charges, and Tracts. By Shute, Bishop of Durham. Lond. 1811. 8vo. pp. 297, 298.

† Ib. p. 310.

‡ Ib. p. 312.

theological system to which they had attached themselves), that no man can be Scripturally said to have experienced a spiritual regeneration but one who brings forth the fruits of the Spirit. And, under God, we owe this continuance of at least a Scriptural nomenclature among us to that first principle of our Church's creed, the supremacy of Holy Scripture as the sole Divine rule of faith. So long as we reverence Holy Scripture, so long must we refuse to pronounce any one to be spiritually born again, who does not exhibit the Scriptural evidences of that new birth.

It is not for us to undertake to *pronounce,* in the case of individuals, that this change has *not* taken place, except where the want of it is too plainly evinced to admit of a doubt in any mind, but it is our duty to point out what are the necessary and essential tests of that change having taken place, and to keep to Scriptural language in our expressions respecting it.

Hence the great majority of our divines of the Arminian school, wishing to affix an affirmative sense to our Baptismal Service for Infants, have (as well as some Calvinists) understood the terms used in those Services, describing the blessings connected with the rite, in a qualified sense, as merely referring either to introduction into the visible Church with its attendant privileges, or to what may be called infantine regeneration. They have thus been enabled to interpret the Service as speaking affirmatively, without adopting a view directly opposed to the testimony of Scripture.

But such an interpretation of the terms clearly involves some difficulties, for the expressions evidently favor the notion of their referring to the full baptismal blessing. And this has been felt by others, who were however equally, or more, unwilling to resort to the original and intended meaning of the Service. Hence a class of divines has arisen among us, who assert that spiritual regeneration, in the proper sense of the words, is always conferred upon all infants in their baptism; and consequently, that in the case of those baptized in their infancy, the word regeneration must never be used except to describe what took place at their baptism. And they endeavour to avoid the difficulty arising from the subsequent state of sin and disobedience of a vast number of those baptized as infants, by maintaining, that,

though spiritually regenerated, they need generally in after life *conversion* or *renovation*, which they distinguish from regeneration. Such phraseology, however, is manifestly unauthorised by Holy Scripture, and certainly unknown to the *majority* of our best divines, even of the last century ;* and seems to be adopted merely to get over a difficulty. In fact, all the disputes and all the perplexities that have troubled the minds of members of our communion on this subject, have arisen, either from an unconsciousness of the original meaning of our Services, or an unwillingness to understand them in that sense. For, as we have seen, so long as this original sense was remembered and sanctioned in our Church, so long even the Calvinistic Puritans found no fault with our Services on the point now in question.

Nor must I omit to observe, that there is often much contradiction and confusion observable, in the writings of those divines who speak most strongly in favor of the doctrine that the word regeneration ought to be used only to signify what takes place in Baptism.

Thus, for instance, Dr. Nicholls, while, in his Commentary upon the Baptismal Service, he gives a long note (in which, by the way, he refers for proof to authors who are directly against him) limiting the word regeneration to what takes place in baptism, he himself, in his Commentary on the Catechism, tells us that the phrase "child of God" does *not* mean "one who is a child of God by *spiritual regeneration* and actual holiness."†

So again, in Dr. Waterland's treatise, entitled, "Regeneration stated and explained." He is perhaps the principal author of the last century, who laboured to confine the use of the word *regeneration* to baptism; and his reasons may be seen in this treatise. But his statements, when examined, will be found to

---

* It is observable, that one of the most strenuous supporters of this view, the late Archdeacon Daubeny, is compelled to acknowledge, that "it has been no uncommon thing for divines of eminence to speak of bad Christians as being *unregenerate* men" (Considerations on Doctrine of Regeneration, p. 41.) The difficulty would be to produce any comparatively respectable catena of our divines who have not done so. The extracts given above (and they might be added to, to any extent) show, that the words "conversion" and "renovation" have been constantly used by our best divines as synonymous with *adult regeneration*, or, at least, as necessarily included in it.

† Comment on the Book of Common Prayer. 1710. fol.

turn more upon *words* than *things*. For he uses the word regeneration in two senses, making renovation a part of regeneration in adults, admitting that in all who have the use of reason regeneration "takes in renovation to make it complete,"* but considering infants incapable of renovation, he makes their regeneration different, and says, that "regeneration may be granted and received, as in infants, where that renovation has *no place at all, for the time being*:"† and while he admits that renovation does not always accompany baptism in adults, he would nevertheless, even in their case, limit the use of the word "regeneration" to what takes place at their baptism, though compelled to add,—

"Their regeneration *begun* in Baptism, and left *unfinished* (like an indenture executed on one side only, or like a part without a counterpart) comes at last to be *complete*, that is, actually salutary; not by a formal regeneration (as if nothing had been done before) but by the repentance of the man, and by *the sanctification or renovation of the heart and mind through the Spirit, which had been hitherto wanting*."‡

But if, as he maintains, renovation is a part of regeneration (and it must certainly be the most important part), a man cannot properly be said to be wholly regenerated without it, and therefore still needs to be regenerated in the full and proper sense of the word.

And all that he ventures to assert as to the inward part of regeneration, connected with the baptism of infants, is,—

"It may *reasonably be* PRESUMED, that from the time of their new birth of water and the Spirit, (which at that very moment is a renewal of their STATE to God-ward,) the renewing also of the HEART MAY come gradually on with their first dawnings of *reason*, in such measures as they shall yet be capable of; in a way to us imperceptible, but known to that Divine Spirit who regenerates them, and whose temple from thenceforth they are, till they defile themselves with actual and grievous sin. *In this case, it is to be noted, that regeneration precedes, and renovation can only follow after*."§

So that after all, it is only a "reasonable *presumption*" with him, that what he himself admits to be a necessary part of "re-

* Works, ed. 1843. vol. 4. p. 444.
† Ib. p. 433.
‡ Ib. p. 444.
§ Ib. p. 440.

generation" in adults, *ever* does take place in those baptized in infancy. All that he supposes to take place at their baptism, is "a renewal of their *state*," and he thinks it "may reasonably be *presumed*," that a "renewing of the heart MAY" follow. The fact is, that Waterland had too much good common sense and knowledge of Scripture to be self-consistent in handling the notion he had imbibed on the subject of Baptism. He saw that where Scripture speaks of the new birth, it describes it as something which has a transforming effect upon the heart and conduct, and therefore that it must include renovation; he saw that multitudes of infants from the first dawn of reason exhibited no signs of such renovation, and therefore he is compelled virtually to deny in one place, what he asserts in another, and when he comes to the point in the case of infants, involuntarily shrinks from taking the ground which consistency required.

The controversy which has now for so many years, during the present century, agitated our Church on this subject, was mainly caused by the introduction of a Tract in 1815, written by the late Bishop Mant, among the publications of the Christian Knowledge Society. And so completely opposed was the doctrine of this Tract to the previous publications of the Society for more than a century, that an attempt was secretly made to introduce alterations in the phraseology of some of the oldest Tracts on the Society's list, to make them consistent with the doctrine of the new Tract. Thus in Nelson's Companion for the Festivals and Fasts, the word "regeneration" was (without notice) changed into "renovation." And Bishop Bradford's Tract on "Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration," which I have quoted above, and which in 1810 the Society had pronounced to be "judicious and Scriptural," somehow became "out of print," until a reclamation reproduced it, when it appeared without the "Advertisement" previously attached to it. The late excellent Mr. Biddulph, in his reply to Dr. Mant's Tract,* gave extracts from forty-eight of the Society's publications (among which nine were by Archbishops and Bishops), opposing the doctrine of the new Tract. The doctrine of Dr. Mant, however, was with some parties at that time the more popular of the two, and from that

* Baptism a seal of the Christian Covenant. By T. T. Biddulph, M.A., &c. Lond. 1816, 8vo.

day to this the most strenuous efforts have been made by its supporters to get it recognized as the doctrine of our Church. Dr. Mant's Tract was a fitting pioneer for its Oxford successors just twenty years after; and it is a remarkable indication of the progress of the Romanizing current in our Church, that what was then carefully vindicated from the charge of having a Romeward tendency, is now unblushingly put forward by a Bishop of our Church as a doctrine in which "we are agreed with Rome."

The authorities given in the preceding pages have, however, I trust, amply vindicated our Church from such a charge. And by them I leave the reader to determine the true doctrine of the Church of England on this important subject.

Appendix.

No. I.

Luther's Form for the Baptism of Infants, according to the second edition published by him in German in 1524, *and translated and published in Latin in* 1526.*

Libellus de Baptizandis Infantibus, per D. Mart. Lutherum adornatus, Anno Domini 1526.

Martinus Lutherus Christiano Lectori gratiam et pacem in Christo, Domino nostro.

Cum videam et audiam quotidie, quanta negligentia et quam exigua severitate, ne dicam levitate, sublime, sanctum ac salutare Sacramentum Baptismi infantium tractetur: cujus quidem rei et hæc una causa est, quod assistentes non intelligunt, quid ibi vel dicatur vel agatur: non tantum utile, sed necessarium quoque mihi videtur, ut in vernacula lingua administretur. Quæ igitur latino idiomate fiebant hactenus, in vernaculam linguam transtuli, ac cœpi germanicis verbis baptizare: ut susceptores infantum ac reliqui assistentes, ad majorem fidem, et severiorem intentionem exsuscitarentur, atque ipsi pastores administrantes baptismum, propter auditores plus diligentiæ adhiberent.

Rogo autem ex Christiana fide omnes, tum baptizantes, tum suscipientes, ipsos infantes, aut alioquin assistentes, ut hoc summum opus, remque seriam, quæ hic comprehenditur, perpendant. Audis enim in verbis istarum precationum quantis querelis, quantaque severitate infans ab Ecclesia afferatur, quamque constantibus et indubiis verbis coram Deo fateatur, eum à Diabolo obsessum, ac filium peccati atque iræ esse, quamque ardenter auxilium et gratiam per Baptismum, ut Filius Dei fiat, postulet.

---

* Taken from the reprint attached to Ecclesiæ Evangelicæ Libri Symbolici. Ed. C. M. Pfaff. Tubing. 1730, 8vo. By whom the Latin translation was made, I do not know. The *first* edition of the original German was published by Luther in 1523, and differs a little from the *second*. A reprint of both will be found in Walch's edition of Luther's works, Magdeb. 1744. 4to. vol. x. col. 2624-37. Archbishop Laurence (Bampton Lectures, p. 378) incorrectly ascribes the date of 1527 to the second edition of this Form.

Cogites itaque, nequaquam esse ludum, contra Diabolum agere, eumque non solum ab infante propulsare, sed tam potentem hostem contra infantem irritare, ut necessitas summa exigat, toto pectore, et fide valida infanti auxilium præstare, et seria intentione preces facere, ut non tantum hunc infantem Deus, ut sonant verba orationis, à potestate Diaboli liberet, sed etiam corroboret, ut contra ipsum tum vivens tum moriens, fortiter dimicare et subsistere valeat. Equidem vereor, hanc ipsam esse causam, cur tam multi post baptismum degenerent, quia tam frigide ac negligenter baptismus est tractatus, ac sine omni severitate preces recitatæ sunt.

Quare scias, hæc externa in actione baptismi, omnium esse minimi momenti, utpote fiare in faciem, insignire cruce, salem ori inserere, sputum et lutum aliinere auriculis et naribus, oleo in pectore et scapulis ungere, et crismate verticem tangere, indusiolum induere, faculam ardentem in manus præbere, et si qua sunt alia ejusmodi, quæ ab hominibus ad ornandum Baptismum sunt adjuncta. Nam absque istis omnibus Baptismus conferri potest, nec sunt res illæ potissimæ, quas Diabolus abhorret aut fugit. Nam his longe majora fastidit. Necesse est hic serio rem geri.

Des igitur operam, ut in vera fide hic assistas verbum Dei audias, et serio Deum invoces. Quando enim Minister verbi inquit, Oremus; te quoque exsuscitat, ut una preces facias. Eadem quoque verba, quæ à Ministro recitantur, in corde susceptores infantis simul recitent, et qui alioquin circumstant. Eamque ob causam Minister eas precationes clare et tarde pronunciet, ut susceptores audire ac percipere queant, ut et ipsi susceptores unanimi spiritu cum Ministro orent, causam infantis Deo serio exponant, totisque viribus contra Diabolum pro infante pugnent, atque per omnia se gerant, ut qui serio agant, siquidem etiam Diabolo non est lusus.

Et propter istas causas æquum ac justum est, ne ad Baptismum ebrii aut profani Ministri admittantur, neque ad officium susceptorum homines leves vocentur, sed potius pii, modesti ac graves Ministri et patrini adhibeantur, de quibus eam possimus habere persuasionem, quòd eam rem summo studio et vera fide sint effecturi: Ne hoc sublime Sacramentum ludibrio exponatur Diabolo, et Deus contumelia afficiatur, qui in Baptismo nos tam immensis et inexhaustis divitiis gratiæ perfundit, ita ut ipsemet regenerationem nominet, ut à tyrannide Diaboli erepti, à peccato, morte, inferno liberati, fiamus filii vitæ, ac hæredes omnium bonorum Dei, imo ipsius Dei liberi ac fratres Christi efficiamur. Non igitur optimi Christiani tam negligenter, tam inenarrabile Dei donum tractemus. Nam Baptismus unica nostra consolatio est, et introitus ad cœlestia bona, et ad societatem omnium sanctorum, ad quam nos Deus deducat, Amen.

Non autem volui mutare multa, licet optarim melius armatam esse istam formam. Nam negligentes habuit autores, qui dignitatem Baptismi non satis perpenderunt. Verum pleraque sic relinquo, ne infirmæ conscientiæ querulentur, me novum Baptismum instituere, neve hactenus baptizati criminentur quasi non sint recte baptizati. Nam, ut dictum est, in adjectionibus humanis non multum est situm, modo ipse Baptismus verbo Dei, vera fide, et seria invocatione Dei administretur. Deo te commendo, Amen.

Baptizans dicat :

Exi spiritus immunde, et locum præbe Spiritui sancto.

Postea facta cruce in fronte et pectore, dicat :

Accipe signum crucis, tum in fronte, tum in pectore.

Oremus :

Omnipotens æterne Deus, Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, invoco te super isto N. servo tuo, petenti baptismi tui dona, et gratiam tuam æternam per spiritualem regenerationem flagitanti : suscipe eum Domine, et sicut dixisti : Petite et accipietis, quærite et invenietis, pulsate et aperietur : præbe igitur bonum petenti, aperi ostium pulsanti, ut hujus cœlestis lavacri benedictionem consequatur, et promissum regnum gratiæ tuæ accipiat, per Christum Dominum nostrum, Amen.

Oremus :

Omnipotens æterne Deus, qui pro judicio tuo severo, mundum infidelem diluvio perdidisti, et fidelem Noah cum octo animabus pro tua magna misericordia custodivisti, et Pharaonem induratum cum suo exercitu in mari rubro submersisti, et populum tuum siccis pedibus traduxisti, quibus historiis lavacrum hoc Baptismi præfigurasti : et baptismo tui dilectissimi Filii Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Jordanem omnesque alias aquas, in salutare diluvium, et copiosam ablutionem peccatorum consecrasti et instituisti : Te oramus, ut ex inexhausta misericordia tua, hunc N. propitius respicias, veraque fide per Spiritum sanctum dones, ut hoc salutari diluvio in ipso submergatur et intereat, quidquid ex Adam in ipsum propagatum est, et ipsemet addidit, utque ex infidelium numero ereptus, in arca sanctæ Ecclesiæ tuæ tutus conservetur, indesinenter spiritu fervens, ac spe gaudens, nomini tuo serviat, ut cum fidelibus omnibus juxta tuam promissionem vitam æternam adipiscatur, per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum.

Adjuro te impure spiritus, in nomine Patris † et Filii † et Spiritus sancti † ut exeas et discedas ab hoc servo Jesu Christi N. Amen.

Audiamus Evangelium S. Marci : (Marc. 10. 13.)

Et offerebant ei parvulos, ut tangeret eos. Discipuli autem comminabantur offerentibus. Quos cum videret Jesus, indigne tulit, et

ait illis : Sinite parvulos venire ad me, et ne prohibueritis eos : Talium enim est regnum cœlorum. Amen dico vobis : Quisquis non receperit regnum Dei velut parvulus, non intrabit in illud. Et complexans eos, et imponens manus super eos, benedicebat eis.

Post hæc imposita manu in caput infantis, cum susceptoribus oret flexis genibus :

Pater noster qui es in cœlo. Sanctificetur nomen tuum. Adveniat regnum tuum. Fiat voluntas tua sicut in cœlo, et in terra. Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie. Et dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris. Et ne nos inducas in tentationem. Sed libera nos à malo, Amen.

Postea deducatur infans ad baptisma, et Minister dicat :

Dominus custodiat introitum et exitum tuum, ab hoc et in seculum. Deinde Minister jubeat infantem per susceptores renunciare, et dicat :

N. Renuncias diabolo ?

Responsio, Ita.

Et omnibus operibus ejus ?

Responsio, Ita.

Et omnibus pompis ejus ?

Responsio, Ita.

Postea interroget :

Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli et terræ ?

Responsio, Ita.

Credis in Jesum Christum Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum, natum et passum, &c.

Responsio, Ita.

Credis in Spiritum sanctum, sanctam Ecclesiam Christi, communionem sanctorum, remissionem peccatorum, resurrectionem carnis, ac post mortem vitam æternam ?

Responsio, Ita.

Visne baptizari ?

Responsio, Ita.

Hic accipiat infantem, eumque immergens in aquam, dicat :

Baptizo te in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti.

Ibi susceptores infantulum apprehendant, ac Minister donec album indusium induit, dicat :

Omnipotens Deus, et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui te per aquam et Spiritum sanctum regenuit, et omnia peccata tibi remisit, confirmet te per gratiam suam ad æternam vitam, Amen.

Pax tecum.

Responsio, Amen.

No. II.

The Order and Form of Baptism (including the Prefatory Remarks on the subject of Baptism), inserted in the Brandenburg and Nuremberg Liturgy of 1533.*

OF BAPTISM.

In all ecclesiastical usages we must diligently mark what God has commanded and instituted, and what men have added thereto, in order that we may hold the divine as the essential part, and diligently practise it, and on the other hand judge the human additions, whether or not they are things indifferent, and if indifferent, whether they are also useful or not, in order that what is contrary to God's word, or otherwise unprofitable, may be done away.

Now God himself has instituted and ordained Baptism, that we should baptize with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But men have added of their own accord Prayer, (recitation of the) Gospel, sponsors, chrisom-cloth, blessing of the font, oil, salt, and spittle, &c. Now, whatever of these things tends to profit and improvement should for the present be suffered to remain; but whatever is unprofitable and causes offence, should be suffered to fall into disuse.

Now, the saying of Prayer thereat, and the reading of the Holy Gospel, is not only allowable, but also useful and good; therefore it should be suffered to remain. In like manner also sponsors, especially on account of the Anabaptists, who now-a-days pretend that they do not know whether they be baptized or not; in order that the sponsors principally, together with other persons, may give testimony, and in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every matter may be established. (Deut. xix.) Also in order that some one may answer for the child, and if he should be prematurely deprived of his parents by death, they may remind the children what they have engaged on their behalf at their baptism, and keep a strict watch over them that they may fulfil it, and learn God's Commandments, Creed, and Prayer.

---

* Kirchen Ordnung, In meiner guedigen herrn der Marggraven zu Brandenburg, und..der Stat. Nürmberg. &c. 1533, fol. The above translation from this work has been made for me by a friend.

It will be seen, by a comparison of the *Form of Baptism* here given, with the preceding by Luther, that they are identical.

But the blessing of the font, oil, salt, and spittle, &c. darken rather than advance the essential parts of baptism, and only serve to superstition. Moreover, the prayer and blessing with which the font, salt, and oil are consecrated, have no foundation in God's word, but are in many respects at variance with it. Moreover, inasmuch as the holy Christian Church from the beginning has not considered such things as necessary, but has always acknowledged them to be indifferent, and that if a child be baptized with simple common water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, although all the other additions have been omitted, yet nothing has in this case been done amiss, but the child is rightly baptised, therefore these things ought at this time to be omitted.

And since Baptism is the sign of the covenant with us Christians under the New Testament, just as Circumcision was of that with the Jews under the Old Testament, young children ought, on the request of their parents, to be baptised, at as early a period as possible: for even young children were circumcised, according to God's commands, as early as the eighth day. And Christ says, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God: and Paul calls baptism a laver of regeneration. Now young children, however tender their years, have need to be regenerated, if they are to enter into the kingdom of God. Moreover, we believe that the Apostles baptised children, inasmuch as they baptised whole households, and are sure that no one can prove any other or contrary conclusion from the Holy Scriptures.

Pastors and ministers, however, must give all diligence, that for such necessary work of Christian baptism, intelligent sponsors be chosen, who know to what end they are there present, in order that the baptism may be conducted with true devotion, sobriety, and propriety. They ought, too, themselves to take good heed that they be not light-minded, inconsiderate, in an unsuitable frame of mind, or the worse for wine, in order that they may pronounce the Christian prayers, and above all, the word on which baptism principally depends, distinctly and seriously, that they may not move the audience that stand by to levity, or otherwise offend them, but rather give occasion to devotion and good Christian thoughts. In like manner they shall enjoin the people who are present, especially the children, to avoid all levity, indecency, and scandal, and on the contrary, devoutly to pray for grace, salvation, faith, and everlasting happiness, in behalf of the baptised child; inasmuch as Christ has given us so comfortable a promise, that whatsoever we ask in his name He will give unto us.

And such decency, seriousness, and devotion will doubtless follow,

not only in the ministers of the Church, but also in the surrounding audience, if we diligently lay to heart the exceeding great benefit which the Father of all compassion, of his mere mercy, bestows upon us through our dear Lord Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, and the great and salutary work which he by the power of his eternal word then and there worketh in us. For thereby we are incited to praise, to invoke, and freely to confess his holy and divine name. For not the minister, nor any creature, but God himself, here worketh eternal life and happiness. Wherefore also our dear Lord Jesus Christ has commanded to baptise, not in our own, nor yet in the name of any saint or angel, but in the name of God the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

But in order that we may contemplate this work of God with deeper feeling and in a more orderly way, we must first diligently consider in how great misery and wretchedness, according to the testimony of Divine Scripture, we are all alike involved. Secondly, what great mercy God has shewn towards us through our Lord Jesus Christ, in that he has delivered us from it by baptism. And thirdly, how we should bear in mind such grace of baptism at all times, but especially in trouble, and praise and glorify God for the same.

First.

We must seriously consider that we were all fallen, by Adam's transgression, through the envy of Satan, under the wrath, curse, displeasure, and malediction of God, and were taken captives under the power of sin, and death, and under the dominion of the devil and hell, so that we were all by nature the children of wrath, and with all our powers, works, practices, and piety, could do nothing pleasing to God, right, good, and salutary to ourselves; but every thing that we could, did, or worked, was, from our corrupt nature, accursed, sinful, and worthy of death, damnable, and subject to the devil. For because our birth from Adam (of whom we are born to [this] natural earthly life,) is guilty of transgression and accursed of God, so that all men must die in him, and bear his earthly image in the mortal body of sin; it follows that all our actions and whole life, which flows from such natural birth, must be damnable and accursed, however great, holy, wise, and good it may appear before men. For whatsoever is born of the flesh is flesh, damnable, accursed, merely dead, sin, and worthy of hell. Wherefore also flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. For that which is flesh lives carnally, is carnally minded, at enmity with God, not subject to the law of God. For they that are in the flesh cannot please God; carnal wisdom is death. Wherefore Christ our dear Lord

speaking to Nicodemus, decides thus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born anew of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God, nor enter therein."

Secondly.

We must diligently reflect how great mercy and compassion God shews us in baptism, in manifesting toward us his condescension and loving-kindness, and saving us, not for the righteousness of works which we have done, but according to his mercy, by the laver of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. For he then and there, by virtue of the word, kills, destroys, and washes away by his Spirit whatsoever makes us sinners, defiled, or accursed, just as in the Red Sea he drowned the enemies of his people, and destroyed in the deluge all flesh except eight souls who were preserved. So also this laver saves us by the word of God, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, as is done outwardly in corporal washing, but the covenant of a good conscience with God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, whereby in virtue of the Divine Covenant we are purged and assured in our consciences, both with God's word and outward token, that all which can defile or condemn us is taken away, dead, annihilated and forgiven. We are also free and unburdened in conscience, and sure that we are united in covenant with God, who will reckon nothing to our condemnation. On the other hand, we, on our parts, must avoid the sins which have been forgiven, and be, as it were, dead to them; for all we who are baptised into Jesus Christ, are baptised into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, and thus are dead to sin and all our old life, and set at rest, so that nothing can condemn us, or separate us from the grace of God; for he that is dead is justified from sin, and is no longer subject to the power of the devil, death, and sin; and, although he still feels sin in the flesh, yet it is not reckoned to his condemnation, on account of the justification of the Spirit. Besides all this, baptism works in us a new divine life, with which God is well pleased. For like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so must we also walk in newness of life. But as we have been planted together with him to a like death, so shall we also partake in a like resurrection to eternal life. Therefore we must reckon ourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord, in whom we are also circumcised by the putting off of the sinful body of the flesh, being buried with him by baptism, in which also we are risen by faith. For God, who raised him up from the dead, has also together with him quickened us, who were dead in sins, and in the uncircumcision of our flesh or carnal life,

which is the true uncircumcision. Now, although our life is for the present hid with Christ in God, yet when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory, as those whom God has according to his great mercy begotten to a living hope through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away; not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, viz., by the living word of God, in which word the water or outward baptism is contained, and really works in us with power all the things above mentioned.

Thirdly.

We ought at all times, with gratitude towards God, to take comfort from this so gracious gift of our baptism; and the more pain and great misery we experience, the more certainly ought we to believe that God is secretly working in us, in virtue of baptism, by his word and Spirit, the mortification of our old life of sin, and renovation of the same. Therefore we should be comforted and joyful in our conscience, and assured that our works please God; and if suffering or temptation befall us, we should remember that we are baptised, and that God, in virtue of the covenant of Baptism, has slain and is yet daily slaying by affliction all evil in us, by the death of Christ; and on the other hand is working renovation of the spirit, by virtue of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Therefore we are now justly bound to thank God and praise him for his unspeakable grace, and moreover earnestly and devoutly to beseech him, that he would accomplish the work he has begun in us, and in all those who are called and brought to Christian baptism.

Pastors and Preachers too ought to be diligent in instructing the people, at convenient times, in their sermons, concerning Baptism, in such wise that they may lead them to the above understanding and consideration thereof.

And inasmuch as a laudable and well-grounded custom has hitherto been observed among Christian people, that in case of necessity any Christian person, but especially the midwives, have baptised young children, which has been then called private baptism, pastors ought most diligently to instruct and warn midwives, that they take baptism in hand seriously and in the fear of God, but chiefly that they know how to recite the word, (I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost) quite distinctly and orderly. And moreover those women who attend upon pregnant and lying-in women, and are also present at the private baptism, should be admonished to pay careful and reverent attention to the matter, in order to guard against all impediment or error.

And whosoever has received the private baptism above mentioned ought to rest therein, and there is no need to baptise him a second time (sub conditione), according to the needless abuse of former times, chiefly to avoid giving great occasion thereby to the error of the Anabaptists.

Pastors and Preachers ought also to instruct women in child-bed, that they are not under the power of the devil, as has hitherto been imagined, not without singular prejudice to consciences, and with gross error. And although they are more liable than other sick persons to strange visions and dreams, yet this ought not by any means to terrify them, for such may be the effect of remaining weakness of body. And although perhaps Satan may presume to assail women in childbed more than other people, he does so no doubt, as his manner is, in order thereby to bring into contempt the estate of matrimony, which God has blessed, and God's work, as though it were impure, whereas on the contrary it is holy, and even the principal vocation of women, by which they please God, as Paul speaks: "She shall be saved in child-bearing, if she continue in faith and love and holiness, with sobriety." (1 Tim. ii.)

Therefore also the benediction after childbed is unnecessary. For it springs from mere superstition, just as if they were desecrated by the birth, which comes from God's blessing. Yet they should nevertheless keep at home for a proper time, that they may avoid injuring themselves or the infants in their health, which is not well pleasing to God.

Order of Baptism.

First, the Priest shall enquire whose is the child, what is to be its name, and whether it have not been privately baptised?

If it be found that the infant has, in a case of necessity, been baptised by the midwife, or by some other person, or, as it is called, privately baptised, it is by no means to be baptised again, but commended to the Christian congregation who are assembled together with the child in the church, as follows:—

First, the Minister shall read, from the prescribed Form, the second and third Article. And he shall begin the second thus: Dearly beloved, consider how great grace and mercy, &c. And the third thus: Therefore we ought, &c. And at the end he shall conclude thus: But especially in this his servant N., or in this his handmaid N., whom he hath called and brought to the grace of his baptism. Repeat the Lord's Prayer. After that he shall read the Gospel, and finally conclude thus: The Lord preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from henceforth even for ever. Peace be with

thee: Amen. Or: The Almighty God, &c., as is written at the end of the Order of Baptism.

If however the child has not been privately baptised, the Minister shall say the following exhortation, and by no means omit it through neglect, except in a time of necessity, if the child be in danger of death, for in such a case he may act according to circumstances, as has been sufficiently explained above.

Dearly beloved, I charge and intreat you all who are assembled here present, by your Christian charity and faith, that you would in the first place lay to heart and diligently consider this excellent work of God, and the great importance that belongs to it and is expressed therein. For by the words of this prayer you hear, and also see by the work, in how wretched and miserable an estate the Christian Church brings this infant hither, and confesses thus constantly and publicly before God, that the same infant is a child of wrath, of sin, and of displeasure, and therefore begs so earnestly for help and mercy, that it may become by baptism a child of God. Consider also diligently, that it is no jest or child's play to perform this good Christian work, which opposes the devil, and not only drives him from the child, but also obliges the child to contend with him all his life long as against an unceasing determined enemy. Hence it is highly necessary devoutly to pray with a strong faith and hearty confidence toward God, that God Almighty would not only deliver the infant from the power of the devil, but also would so strengthen it, that living and dying it may make and maintain continual resistance to the enemy. Therefore take good heed to yourselves, that in a right faith, ye stand here, listen to the word of God, and devoutly call upon and beseech him; for we are here exhorted to prayer not in vain, but in a matter of necessity, that God may acknowledge our earnestness and the full confidence of our hearts; and also that this venerable Sacrament may not by our means be exposed to the scorn of the devil, and God Almighty be dishonoured, who therein pours out upon us such an abundant treasure of his grace, that he himself calls baptism a new birth, so that we are thereby made free from all tyranny of the devil, also of sin, death and hell, children of life, heirs of all good things of God, and joint-heirs with Christ. Wherefore let us, in God's name, treat such exceeding riches of divine grace, not contemptuously, but with all due gratitude, for truly this venerable Sacrament of Baptism is our only consolation and entrance to all divine good things and the fellowship of all saints.

Now the Form of Administering baptism is as follows:—

The pastor or baptizing minister shall say,

Go out, thou unclean spirit, and give place to the Holy Spirit.

After this he shall make the sign of the cross on his (the infant's, or baptized person's) forehead and breast, and say,

Receive the sign of the Holy Cross, both in thy forehead, and in thy breast.

Let us Pray.

O Almighty and Everlasting God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, I call upon thee in behalf of this N. thy servant, who asks for the gift of thy baptism, and desires thine everlasting mercy through spiritual regeneration. Receive him, O Lord, and as thou hast said: "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you:" so extend now, Eternal God, thy goodness and grace to him who asks, and open the gate unto him that knocks, that he may obtain the everlasting benediction of this heavenly laver, and receive the promised riches of thy gift, through Christ our Lord: Amen.

Let us Pray.

Almighty and Everlasting God, who according to thy severe judgment didst condemn the unbelieving world by the flood, but of thy great mercy didst preserve faithful Noah the eighth person; who didst drown in the Red Sea hardened Pharoah with all his army, while thou didst lead thy people Israel on dry land through the midst of it, and didst also figure and represent thereby for future time this laver of thy holy baptism; and likewise by the baptism of thy dear child our Lord Jesus Christ didst sanctify and ordain the Jordan and all other waters for a salutary flood and the abundant washing away of sins: we pray thee by the same thine unfathomable mercy that thou wouldest mercifully look upon this N., and endue and strengthen him with right faith in the Spirit, that by this wholesome deluge all [sin] that he has received by birth from Adam, and he himself has added thereto, may be drowned in him and perish, that he may also be separated from the number of unbelievers, and preserved dry and safe in the holy ark of Christendom, ever to serve thy name, fervent in spirit and joyful in hope, that he may be counted worthy, with all the faithful, to attain thy promise of everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord: Amen.

I command thee, thou unclean spirit, in the name of the Father †, and of the Son†, and of the Holy Ghost †, to come out and depart from this servant of Jesus Christ, N. Amen.

Let us hear the Holy Gospel of St. Mark.

At that time they brought young children to Jesus that he should touch them, but the disciples rebuked those that brought them. When Jesus saw it he was displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of God like a little child, shall not enter therein. And he took them in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.

Then let the Priest lay his hands upon the head of the child, and repeat the Lord's Prayer, together with the Godfathers and Godmothers, all kneeling.

Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

Then let the child be brought to the font, and the Priest say,

The Lord preserve thy coming in and thy going out, from henceforth even for evermore.

Then shall the Priest cause the child by his sponsors to renounce the Devil, and shall say,

N. Dost thou renounce the Devil?—*Answer.* Yes,
And all his works? .....—*Answer.* Yes,
And all his actions? .....—*Answer.* Yes,
} I renounce [him, or, them.]

Then he demands,

Dost thou believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth? *Answer:* Yes, I believe.

Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, on the third day risen again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitting on the right hand of God the heavenly Father, from whence he will come to judge the quick and the dead? *Answer:* Yes, I believe.

Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost, a Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, Forgiveness of sins, Resurrection of the flesh, and everlasting life after death? *Answer:* Yes, I believe.

Wilt thou be baptised? *Answer:* Yes, I will.

Then let him take the child and dip it in the Font, and say,

And I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Then shall the Godfathers and Godmothers hold the child in the Font, and the Priest shall say, while he is putting on the chrisom,

Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath regenerated thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath forgiven thee all thy sins, strengthen thee with his grace to everlasting life. Amen.

Peace be with thee. *Answer:* Amen.

After the baptism the Pastor or Minister shall exhort the Godfathers and Godmothers nearly as follows:—I exhort you by the Christian charity which you have now shewn in behalf of the infant at his baptism, that if it should lose its parents by death or other accident before it come to the use of reason, you should carefully and faithfully instruct and teach it: First, the ten Commandments, that it may learn thereby to know the will of God and its own sin; Secondly, the Christian faith, by which we obtain grace, forgiveness of sins, and the Holy Ghost; Lastly, also the Lord's Prayer, that it may be able to call upon God, and pray for help, to resist Satan, and to live a Christian life, until God accomplish in him what he has now begun in baptism, and he come to everlasting life.

No. III.

The Forms and Orders for Baptism and Confirmation, with the accompanying observations, drawn up and inserted by Bucer, in the Liturgical work published in 1543, *by Herman Archbishop of Cologne.**

De Sacrosanctis Sacramentis in genere.

. lxviii. v. Pastores et Doctores Ecclesiarum meminerint esse officii sui, magna cura populum docere et instituere, non solum in ipsa Sacra-

* Originally published by him in German at Bonne in 1543, but the above Latin translation was also published at Bonne, and therefore of course under his sanction, in 1545. The title is,—Nostra Hermanni ex gratia Dei Archiepiscopi Coloniensis et Principis Electoris &c. Simplex ac pia Deliberatio, qua ratione, Christiana et in verbo Dei fundata Reformatio, Doctrinæ, Administrationis divinorum Sacramentorum, Cæremoniarum, totiusq; curæ animarum, et aliorum Ministeriorum Ecclesiasticorum, apud eos qui nostræ Pastorali curæ commendati sunt, tantisper instituenda sit, donec Dominus dederit constitui meliorem, uel per liberam et Christianam Synodum, siue Generalem siue Nationalem, uel per Ordines Imperii Nationis Germanicæ in Spiritu Sancto congregatos. Bonnæ 1545. fol. The copy used is one in the Cambridge University Library, G. 9. 20.

mentorum administratione, sed etiam subinde in concionibus, cum locus postulauerit, quid in tractatione, et dispensatione cuiusq; Sacramenti agatur, et exhibeatur, Quomodo se homines ad percipienda Sacramenta præparare debeant, qua item fiducia illa sumere necesse sit, et in quo fiduciam percipiendi beneficii diuini in Sacramentis ponere oporteat, quantumq; studii et Religionis ad Sacramentorum tractationem requiratur, non solum ab iis, qui ipsi utuntur Sacramentis, sed etiam ab iis, qui administrationi eorum, et dispensationi intersunt, maximè uero à Ministris, qui Sacramenta aliis exhibent et distribuunt.

In primis uerò et sedulo monebunt populum, ut ne existimet consequi se posse gratiam Dei, et communionem cum Christo in Sacramentis, ex ui et merito operis externi, siue eius, qui Sacramenta administrat, siue eius, qui ea sumit, sed tantum uirtute Dei, et merito Christi, qui in suo uerbo et Sacramentis efficax esse uult, et iis qui sacramenta iuxta uerbum suum vera fide percipiunt, omnia ea indubitato præstare, quæ sacramentis suis exhibet, et uerbis suis testatur.

De Baptismo.

Baptismus est sacramentum regenerationis, quo Christo Domino inserimur, incorporamur, sepelimur in mortem eius, induimur ea [? eo], atq; efficimur per eum filii, et hæredes Dei. Quare sacramentum hoc oportet summa reuerentia et Religione tractare et percipere, Ac propterea ea ratio administrandi hoc sacramentum ineundum, et eiusmodi tempus, quo administretur, ordinandum est, ut omnia seruiant ad excitandam et augendam reuerentiam et religionem, quo sacrosanctum hoc sacramentum pie et salutariter administretur et percipiatur.

Apud ueteres duobus tantum anni temporibus, Paschæ scilicet et Pentecostes, Baptisma publice administratum est, Quam constitutionem, quia difficile forsitan sit reuocare, uolumus ut Baptisma non nisi Dominicis et Festis diebus, quibus tota conuenire Ecclesia solet, administretur, siquidem non obstiterit imbecillitas infantium, de quibus metuendum, ne non superesse possint ad proximum diem Festum, quò Eucharistiæ tractatio cum Baptismate coniungatur, et ii, qui infantes ad Baptismum attulerunt, corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ex more et instituto primitiuæ Ecclesiæ utantur. Fol. lxix. *recl*

Vt autem religiose et reuerentur omnia cum administrentur, tum percipiantur in hoc Sacramento, parentes infantium Pastoribus Ecclesiarum id maturius significare, et ab iis Baptismum una cum susceptoribus, infantibus suis petere humiliter debent. Vt si uel parentes, uel susceptores, uel utrique obnoxii sunt manifestis cri-

minibus, à Pastore uel corrigantur, si modo correctionem admiserint, uel si incorrigibiles sunt, à communione Baptismi arceri possint, ne ad iudicium, et cum periculo offendendæ Ecclesiæ, tam diuinæ actioni adstent. Tam enim reos se faciunt corporis et mortis Christi, qui huic Sacramento Baptismi indigne adstant, et infantibus suis non uera fide in Christum illud expetunt, quàm qui corpus et sanguinem Domini sumunt indigne, id est, non iuxta institutionem Christi, absque uera scilicet pœnitentia et fide in Christum. Quare si ad Pastores ueniant petitum Sacrum Baptisma, uel parentes infantium, uel eorum susceptores, qui manifestis criminibus et flagitiis contaminati sunt, hos ad pœnitentiam adhortabuntur, et ut hac uice non intersint administrationi huius Sacramenti admonebunt, ne et sibi ipsis iudicium Dei accersant, et Ecclesiæ sint scandalo. Tales enim propter flagitia sua non habent partem in regno Dei, neque ad Sacramentorum communicationem admittendi sunt, nisi publice pœnituerint. Si uero parentes in talibus criminibus deprehensi fuerint, cognatos suos, uel alios amicos, qui Ecclesiæ uera et uiua adhuc membra sunt, rogabunt, ut in eorum loco infantibus suis Baptismum petant. Si susceptores indigni Ecclesia iudicentur, alii rogandi erunt, de quibus bonum extiterit testimonium.

Fol. lxix. *vers.* In petitione uero Baptismi, rogabunt Pastores, an non Baptismum infantes iam receperint, quod fieri solet, dum recens natis mors imminere creditur. Si enim Baptizati fuerint, tum Pastores ea, quæ paulo post de huiusmodi infantibus subiicientur, facere debent. Sed si baptizati non sint, uel non certo, uel non ut oportet, baptizati, et parentes et susceptores non rei fuerint criminum eorum, propter quæ essent à Baptismo arcendi, moneri à Pastoribus diligenter debent, de immenso beneficio regenerationis in Christo, quod pueris expetunt, item de horribili lapsu et reatu, unde infantes per Christum Iesum in Baptismo liberantur. Deinde hortabuntur illos, ut religiose adsint primum Exorcismo et Catechismo, deinde etiam administrationi Baptismi, Postremo, ut simul utantur Sacramento Corporis et Sanguinis Domini, Hoc enim fieri decet non ideo tantum, quòd membra sunt Christi, et asymbolos adesse mensæ Domini non oporteat, uerum etiam, quòd indignum sit infantibus communionem Christi petere, et suscipere in Baptismate, et sibiipsis non eam sumere Sacramento, quo illa ipsis quoq; offertur, Non enim, si uera fide communionem Christi infantibus in Baptismate petunt et percipiunt, poterunt sibiipsis eandem non petere, et oblatam in Sacramento non cupide excipere.

Veteres hoc Sacramentum Cœnæ Domini etiam infantibus una cum Baptismo administrabant, sed cum non sine causa mos ille exoleuerit, congruit, et omnino ex officio est pietatis, parentes unà

cum susceptoribus et cognatis, qui sanctissimum Sacramentum regenerationis suis infantibus accipiunt, cœna Domini singulari Spiritus desyderio uti, ut et sibi Christi communionem accipiant, quam pro infantibus in Baptismo susceperint. Quod et ad aliorum, imo totius Ecclesiæ ædificationem confert, et Sacram Christi communionem cæteris commendat.

Vt ergo diligentius et maiore religione omnia in administratione Sacri Baptismatis gerantur et perficiantur, uolumus, ut ubicunque id commode fieri poterit, Catechismus parentum, et susceptorum, item Exorcismus infantum exhibeatur, pridie eius Festi, uel Dominici diei, quo Baptisma exhibendum erit. Cum enim Baptisma administrari debeat in summa Liturgia, dum tota Ecclesia collecta est, conuenit in his Sacris actionibus utriusque Sacramenti, eam adhiberi moderationem, quæ conducat religioni populi excitandæ, Fol. lxx. *rect.* non prebeat prolixitate occasionem aliquam negligentiæ uel pio animi ardori minuendo. Quare ubi id licebit, utile fuerit actionem Catechismi et Exorcismi, more ueterum, ab actione Baptismi tempore seiungere. At ubi populo, uel quòd plerique à templo longius habitant, uel alia iusta de caussa, commodum adesse non fuerit, ibi licebit Catechismum et Exorcismum cum Baptismo simul administrare.

Istud tamen Pastores, quantum omnino fieri potest, studebunt, ut sanctissimum hoc Sacramentum Baptismi, quod est prima adoptio, susceptio, et ingressus in regnum Christi, non nisi coram uniuersa Ecclesia, et summa cum grauitate et religione administretur et percipiatur.

Quando igitur Catechismus et Exorcismus, pridie quàm Baptismus administretur, habebuntur, infantes deferantur ad uespertinum conuentum, in quo alioqui populus propter instans festum, uel celebrationem Dominicæ diei adesse solet, parentes et cognati exemplo Sanctorum ueterum cum susceptoribus adesse simul, et deducere ad templum suos infantes debent, Quibus congregatis et aliis, debent Pastores et Ministri, his, qui infantes attulerint, et toti reliquo populo, singulari grauitate et religione, primum exponere perspicuè mysterium S. Baptismatis, et ingentia Dei beneficia, quæ in illo exhibentur. Deinde exhortabuntur illos ad piam et fidelem perceptionem tanti Sacramenti, et beneficiorum Christi adeo inæstimabilium. Tum requirent à parentibus, et susceptoribus infantium renunciationem Satanæ et mundi, et confessionem præcipuorum articulorum Fidei, et Religionis nostræ, quam illi confessionem, et renunciationem clarè et grauiter coram uniuersa Ecclesia facere debent.

FORMA CATECHISMI, HOC EST, INSTITVTIONIS, EXHORTATIONIS, ET INTERROGATIONVM AD SUSCEPTORES, ET OMNES EOS QUI INFANTES AD SACRUM BAPTISMA ADFERUNT.

Primum omnium Pastor adstantibus sibi reliquis Ministris ita eos, qui infantes ad Baptismum offerunt, exhortabitur.

Dilecti in Christo Iesu, quotidie ex uerbo Dei audimus, et propria experientia discimus, tàm in uita, quàm in morte, iam inde ab Adæ lapsu nos omnes concipi, et nasci in peccatis, esse reos iræ Dei, et
Fol. lxx. *ters.* damnatos propter Adæ delictum, nisi liberemur morte, et meritis Filii Dei Christi Iesu, nostri unici liberatoris. Cum itaq; præsentes hi infantes communi nobiscum sorte nati sint, dubium non est, quin et ipsi peccato et originali morbo commaculati sint, atq; obnoxii æternæ morti, et damnationi. Sed Deus Pater pro ineffabili sua clementia, et misericordia ergà genus humanum, Filium suumm isit, ut mundum seruaret, quare etiam et hos infantes seruatos uult. Ille peccata totius mundi tulit, et tàm paruulos, quàm nos adultos à peccatis, morte, Diabolo, et æterna condemnatione liberauit et saluos fecit, qui uoluit sibi offerri paruulos, ut iis benedictionem impartiretur. Quare pro Christiana pietate uestra, hunc puerum assumite, et ad Christum adducite, et offerte piis uestris precibus, quò peccatorum suorum ab illo consequatur remissionem, transferatur in regnum gratiæ ereptus à tyrannide Satanæ, et constituatur hæres æternæ salutis. Et uobis certissimum sit, Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, hoc opus charitatis uestræ erga hunc infantem clementissimè respecturum, et preces uestras exauditurum, quia ipse suo uerbo mandauit, Sinite paruulos uenire ad me, talium est enim regnum cœlorum. Quapropter dilecti hortor et obsecro uos, quotquot adestis, ut magnitudinem huius actionis, atqùe operis, quod agimus, religiose uobiscum expendatis, Videtis enim, quàm miserabiliter Ecclesia infantulos istos imbecilles, et omni uirtute destitutos, huc supplex, sed tamen constanter afferat, Quo sanè opere clare confitetur eos esse filios iræ Dei, peccati, et æternæ mortis, Proinde piis uotis, et ardenti oratione pro eis orat, gratiam et auxilium Dei impetrare eis cupiens, quò per Baptismum renati ex Deo, filii Dei efficiantur. Ne putetis igitur leue quiddam, et puerile quid tractari in hac Sacrosancta actione, qua bellum suscipitur cum Satana, qua non tantum ille ab infante expellitur, sed infans Sacramento astringitur, quòd cum hoc semper, ut cum Regis sui Christi hoste belligerari debeat, ad extremum usque Spiritum summa contentione pugnare. Quare magna cum fiducia, et ardentissimis precibus inuocandus est Deus, ut non modo è potestate Satanæ liberare, sed et confirmare, et defendere uelit hunc infantem, ut in omni uita, et

maximè in ipso mortis articulo consistere, et fortiter repugnare illi possit.

Quamobrem et uos animos uestros tollite, et cogitate hic præcipua religione uerbum Dei uobis audiendum esse, uiua fide inuocandum Deum, et grauissima de causa ad orationem hic inuitari uos. Ita ergo agite, ut Deus religionem uestram uideat, eamq; approbet, nec committite, ut sacratissimum hoc Sacramentum Baptismatis per uos indigne tractetur, et Satanæ ludibrio fiat, atq; Deus contumelia adficiatur, qui tantas hic diuitias gratiæ suæ effundit. Nam ipse uocat hoc Sacramentum lauacrum regenerationis, quo nos è tyrannide Diaboli, peccati, mortis, et inferni ereptos, filios suos efficit, et hæredes uitæ æternæ, participes omnium beneficiorum suorum, quia coheredes Christi sui. Fol. lxxi. rect.

Quarè per Deum, et salutem uestram uos obtestor, ut tàm superabundantem gratiam Dei, quæ hoc Sacramento exhibetur, dignè æstimetis, et cum summa animi gratitudine amplectamini, quandoquidem Baptismus magna est nostra consolatio in periculis, et afflictionibus, estq; aditus primus ad omnia beneficia Dei, ad beatam sanctorum omnium societatem.

Vt igitur præsentiore animo, et religione maiore ineffabile hoc Dei beneficium expendamus, initio uidendum nobis est, in quanta mala nos Adæ lapsus coniecerit, Et e contra, quàm immensam gratiam Deus humano generi per Filium suum exhibuerit in eo, quòd per Baptismum nos ab iis redemerit, Et tertio, quàm semper nobis in conspectu esse debeat in omnibus periculis tanta Dei misericordia, quantisque cum laudibus celebrari conveniat Dei gratiam, quam per Baptismum accepimus.

Primum ergò diligentissime expendendum est, omnes nos per peccatum Adæ, et Satanæ inuidiam obnoxios iræ Dei, adeòq; damnatos nos esse, sub potestate et regno Diaboli, detineri sub morte, peccato, et inferno captiuos, adeò ut nos natura filii iræ, nullis uiribus humanis, nullis uirtutibus, uel operibus Deum placare potuerimus. Quicquid enim in nobis, item omnia opera nostra, propter uitiatam naturam maledicta sunt à Deo, et subiecta tyrannidi Satanæ.

Cùm enim per inobedientiam primi parentis Adæ (à quo in naturalem hanc, et terrenam uitam progeniti sumus) omnes rei et maledicti à Deo nascamur, adeo ut omnes in eo mori necesse sit, et terrenam imaginem eius in mortali hoc corpore circumferamus, sequitur totam uitam, et omnes actiones naturæ nostræ ita corruptæ, damnatas à Deo esse, quantumuis etiam speciosissimæ et sanctissimæ coram hominibus appareant. Quicquid enim ex carne natum est, caro est, hoc est, alienum à Deo, repugnans Spiritui, et addictum morti, et gehennæ. Quapropter caro et sanguis non assequentur

Fol. lxxi. *vers.* regnum Dei. Quicquid enim caro est, carnalia sapit, et uiuit, Est inimicum Deo, nam Legi Dei non subditur. Quare qui carnales sunt, Deo placere non possunt, Sapientia carnis mors est. Quare Dominus noster Christus cum Nicodemo disputans ita concludit, Amen amen dico tibi, nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei.

Secundo cogitandum quàm opulenta sit gratia diuina collata nobis in Baptismo, in quo uerè apparet eius erga nos benignitas, et *φιλανθρωπια*, quòd non ex operibus iusticiæ, quæ nos fecissemus, sed secundum suam misericordiam per lauacrum regenerationis, et renouationis Spiritus Sancti saluos nos faciat. Hic enim uirtute uerbi sui abluit, et extinguit, quicquid reos nos facit et damnat, Quemadmodum olim in mari rubro hostes populi sui submersit, atq; per diluuium perdidit totum humanum genus, exceptis octo animabus, quæ in arca seruatæ sunt, Ita lauacrum hoc aquæ, nos per uerbum saluat, non ablutione sordium in carne, uti in aliis lotionibus fieri solet, sed stipulatione bonæ conscientiæ erga Deum, per resurrectionem Iesu Christi. Virtute enim pacti diuini in conscientiis mundamur, et certi reddimur et uerbo et externo signo, peccata quæ nos polluebant et damnabant, omnia esse planè abolita, quia remissa et mortua. Itaq; ex Baptismate certò statuimus, nos Deo acceptos, et fœdere gratiæ sempiterno ei coniunctos esse, adeò ut nihil ab ipso seiungere et damnare possit. Quare porrò non modo fugere peccata, sed etiam extimescere, et abhorrere ab eis debemus, non aliter atqùe ab inferno, ut qui peccatis mortui sumus, Omnes enim, teste Paulo, qui in Christum Iesum baptizati sumus, in mortem eius baptizati sumus, consepulti cum illo per Baptismum in mortem, Proinde peccatis, et toti ueteri homini mortui sumus, et perducti in Christo eò, ut nihil condemnare, uel à gratia Dei separare nos possit, Qui enim mortuus est, justificatus est à peccato, non amplius tyrannidi peccati mortis et inferni subiectus, etiamsi adhuc peccati in carne reliquias sentiat, tamen eæ non imputantur ad condemnationem, propter iustificationem Spiritus in Christo.

Præterea Baptismus nouam uitam operatur in nobis, et acceptam Deo, Vt enim Christus à mortuis resuscitatus est per gloriam Patris, ita efficit suo in nobis Spiritu, ut et nos in nouitate uitæ ambulemus, Nam si insiticii facti sumus illi per similitudinem mortis eius, certè et resurrectionis participes erimus in uitam æternam, illud scientes quòd uetus ille homo cum illo crucifixus est, ut aboleretur corpus
Fol. lxvi. *rect.* peccati, ut posthac non seruiamus peccato.

Quare reputemus nos peccatis reuera mortuos esse, et Deo uiuere in Christo Domino nostro, in quo et circuncisi sumus, circuncisione, quæ fit sine manibus, dum exuimus corpus peccatorum, per circun-

cisionem Christi, Cum illo sepulti sumus per Baptismum, in quo simul etiam cum illo resurreximus per fidem operationis Dei. Deus etenim qui Christum à mortuis resuscitauit, nos unà cum eo conuiuificauit cum peccatis etiam mortui essemus per præputium carnis nostræ, seu carnalis uitæ. Quanquam enim uita nostra in Deo abscondita sit cum Christo, tamen cum Christus uita nostra apparuerit, tunc et nos simul cum illo manifestabimur in gloria, ut quos pro ingenti sua misericordia clementer regenuit Deus in spem uiuam, per resurrectionem Iesu Christi ex morruis [mortuis], in hæreditatem incorruptibilem, incontaminatam, et immarcessibilem, non ex semine corruptibili, sed incorruptibili, uerbo scilicet Dei uiuo, per quod Baptismus consistit, et omnia iam dicta efficaciter et reuera in nobis operatur.

Tertio, de tanta amplitudine gratiæ Dei, et beneficiis per Baptismum collatis nos consolabimur, et semper gratias Deo agemus, idq; eò studiosius, quo grauioribus premamur calamitatibus, confirmantes hinc fidem nostram Deum quamquam non uisibili modo, tamen uirtute Baptismi per uerbum et Spiritum efficacem esse in nobis, mortificare ueterem, et instaurare nouum hominem. Quarè confirmemus conscientias nostras, nos Deo curæ, et ei propter meritum Filii sui gratos et charos esse, et cum rebus aduersis agitamur, et exercemur uariis ærumnis, cogitandum erit baptizatos nos esse, et Baptismo per meritum Christi omnia peccata et mala nostra deuicta et mortua esse, indiesq; magis ac magis per crucem, et uarias afflictiones, quas nobis Dominus mittit, confici et aboleri, et nouum hominem in nobis uirtute resurrectionis Christi, continuò renouari, et instaurari. Merito itaq; Deo pro tam ineffabili sua misericordia agendæ gratiæ sunt, atq; simul orandum, ut opus suum, quod cœpit in nobis, et omnibus, quos ad Baptismum uocauit, semper promouere, ac perficere tandem dignetur. Tales exhortationes uel breuiores, uel longiores, pro temporis ratione concionatores habebunt, ex dictis et aliis Scripturæ locis, quibus subiicientur iuterrogationes sequentes.

INTERROGATIONES AD SUSCEPTORES ET PARENTES INFANTIVM.

Creditis uera esse, quæ modo uobis ex uerbo Dei proposita sunt, de corruptione naturæ per peccatum originale, de regeneratione in Christo Domino nostro, et communione æterna cum Deo, quæ exhibetur per Sacrum Baptisma? Fol. lxxii. *vers.*

Respond.—Credimus.

Petitis ergo ex animo et uera fide, infantem hunc uestrum, per uos Christo adductum et oblatum, à tali naturæ corruptione, per meritum et uirtutem Christi in Baptismate liberari, reconciliari Deo, et in nouam atq; perpetuam uitam regenerari?

Respond.—Petimus.

Renunciatis igitur et uestro et infantis nomine Diabolo, atq; omnibus eius operibus?

Respond.—Renunciamus.

Etiam mundo, et omnibus concupiscentiis eius?

Respond.—Renunciamus.

Creditis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli et terræ?

Respond.—Credimus.

Et creditis Deum uelle et uobis, et huic infanti, cum baptizatus fuerit, esse Patrem, et omnipotenti sua uirtute, sapientia, et misericordia uelle uos ab omni malo seruare, atq; omnibus beneficiis cumulare, ac propterea supra omnia uobis timendum eum, et diligendum esse?

Respond.—Credimus.

Creditis in Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum Filium eius unicum, qui, ut redimeret nos, factus homo est, passus, et mortuus, atq; à morte resuscitatus est, ascendit in cœlos, sedetq; ad dextram Patris, ac regit inde Ecclesiam suam, uirtute omnipotenti, rediturus in fine mundi omnibus conspicuus, iudex uiuorum et mortuorum?

Respond.—Credimus.

Ex hac fide Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum etiam uestrum, et huius pueri Saluatorem esse confitemini, qui morte sua uestra quoq; peccata expiauerit, et Resurrectione sua uos Deo reconciliauerit, atq; iustificauerit, et Spiritu suo omni tandem peccato perpurgatis, diuinam in uobis imaginem, et uitam plenè perfecturus sit?

Respond.—Confitemur.

Creditis et in Spiritum Sanctum, sanctam et Catholicam Ecclesiam, Communionem Sanctorum, Remissionem peccatorum, Carnis resurrectionem, et uitam æternam?

Respond.—Credimus.

Et ex hac confessione creditis Spiritum sanctum etiam uestrum, et infantuli huius doctorem, et consolatorem uelle esse, et uos uera corporis Christi Domini nostri, atqùe Ecclesiæ eius membra esse, et
Fol. lxxiii. *rect.* puerum huic [? hunc] per Baptismum, Christi atq; Ecclesiæ membrum fore, in quo habiturus sit remissionem peccatorum, certam spem resurrectionis, et uitæ æternæ?

Respond.—Credimus.

Vultis ergo infantem è Baptismo suscipere, et habere pro uero filio Dei, fratre et membro Christi, atq; primum ubi ad usum rationis peruenerit, si forte parentibus orbatus fuerit, uel illi hac in re negligentiores extiterint, curam eius habere, quo Decalogum, et articulos Fidei, et orationem Dominicam, Sacramenta, perdiscat, tum domi tum in Ecclesia, quo à primis statim annis mysterium Baptismi, et

collata sibi in eo Christi beneficia intelligere incipiat, ac inde cum de Religione Christi satis institutus fuerit, fidem suam in Ecclesia suo ore confiteatur, et se communicatione Christi, obedientiæ erga Deum atq; Ecclesiam ipse addicat?

Respond.—Volumus.

Hic rursus Pastor parentes et circunstantem multitudinem adhortabitur.

Quod igitur dilecti hic in conspectu Dei, et Christi Seruatoris, qui inter nos est, et coram Ecclesia eius sancta promisistis, id summa fide et diligentia memineritis præstandum esse, Vosq; singuli, parentes, susceptores, et cæteri adstantes, infantulum hunc post acceptum Baptismum ut filium Dei agnoscite, ut membrum Christi Iesu habete, cui Angeli ministri adsint, et inseruiant, nec dubitate, quicquid aut boni, aut mali, huic quàmuis infirmo infantulo exhibueritis, hoc uos Deo, et Christo Domino exhibere. Nullius ergo laboris uos pigeat, quin quisque pro suo loco, pro sanguinis coniunctione, et uocatione hunc curet Domino piè et religiose educandum, et instituendum, quò seruare tandem possit omnia, quæ Christus Seruator nobis præcepit. Pertinet igitur ad uos, qui à Deo dati estis huic infanti parentes, cognati aut susceptores, ubi primum excreuerit, curare, ut ad scholas, ut in Ecclesiam ducatur, quò in Christi mysteriis, et in aliis instituatur plenius, quò gratiam et immensa Dei beneficia, in Baptismo collata intelligat, suæ fidei rationem coram Ecclesia reddat, Diabolo et mundo cum omnibus concupiscentiis, ipsa re renunciet, Christo Domino nostro, et Ecclesiæ eius, sese consecrare in omnem obedientiam studeat, iuxta Euangelium eius, atq; ita in Christo Domino nostro, usq; in finem perseueret, atq; in nouitate uitæ perpetuo proficiat, ut uiuum Christi membrum, et in uite hac palmes fœcundus fructum copiosum ferat omnium bonorum operum, ad laudem Dei, et Ecclesiæ ædificationem. Fol. lxxiii. *vers.*

Seqvitvr Exorcismvs.

Hic Pastor adferri infantem propius iubebit, et de nomine interrogabit, quo cognito dicet, Edico in nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi omnibus malis Spiritibus, ut ab hoc infante recedant, et nihil mali illi ullo modo inferant.

Post pollice signata in fronte, et in pectore figura Crucis, dicat.

Accipe signum sanctæ Crucis in fronte, ut nunquam te Dei, et Christi tui Seruatoris, uel Euangelii eius pudeat, accipe et in pectore, ut uirtus Christi crucifixi tibi perpetuo præsidio sit, et certa in omnibus rebus protectio.

Hinc addat ad populum.

Dominus uobiscum.

Respondeat populus.

Et cum Spiritu tuo.

Pastor.

Oremus. Omnipotens, et æterne Deus, Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, inuoco te super hoc N. famulo aut famula tua, cui Ecclesia Sacramentum Baptismi, et in eo gratiam tuam et regenerationem spiritualem petit, Et ut dixisti, Petite, et accipietis, quærite, et inuenietis, pulsate, et aperietur uobis, ita impartias huic gratiam, et misericordiam tuam, quemadmodum Ecclesia tua orat, ut consequatur redemptionem Filii tui, et hæreditatem æternæ et beatæ uitæ, quam ei Ecclesia tua per Baptismum quærit, Aperi ei ostium regni tui, ad quod pro eo Ecclesia tua pulsat, per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

Oremus. Pater omnipotens Deus, qui olim impium mundum horribili iudicio tuo per diluuium perdidisti, et solam familiam pii Noe, octo tantum animas, pro ineffabili misericordia tua conseruasti, et qui obduratum Aegyptiorum Regem Pharaonem cum omnibus copiis, et uirtute eius bellica submersisti in mari rubro, populumq; tuum Israheliticum siccis pedibus transire fecisti, et in his lauacrum regenerationis Sacrum Baptisma adumbrare uoluisti, Præterea Baptismate filii tui Christi Iesu Iordanem, et cæteras aquas ad sanctam demersionem, atq; ablutionem peccatorum consecrasti. Rogamus te pro immensa misericordia tua, infantem hunc propitius respice, ueram illi fidem, et Spiritum Sanctum tuum dona, ut per hoc sacrosanctum diluuium in eo submergatur et pereat, quicquid ex Adamo sordium contraxit, ut ex impiorum numero segregatus, in sancta Ecclesiæ tuæ arca tutus seruari possit, et nomen tuum alacri, et feruenti Spiritu semper confiteri, et sanctificare, et regno tuo constanti fiducia, et certa spe inseruire, quò tandem cum piis omnibus promissionem æternæ uitæ assequatur, per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum, Amen.

Fol. lxxiv. *recl.*

Pastor.—Dominus uobiscum.

Populus.—Et cum Spiritu tuo.

Audite Sacrosanctum Euangelium Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

Marci X.

In illo tempore, Attulerunt ad Iesum pueros, ut tangeret illos. Discipuli uero increpabant eos, qui adducebunt [adducebant]. Cum uidisset autem Iesus, indignatus est, et dixit illis, Sinite paruulos uenire ad me, ne prohibete illos, talium enim est regnum Dei. Amen dico uobis, quicunq; non acceperit regnum Dei tanquàm puer, haudquaquam ingredietur in illud. Et cum cœpisset [cepisset] eos in ulnas, impositis manibus super illos, benedixit illis.

His uerbis et huic facto Domini nostri Iesu Christi super illos, fidem habete, nec dubitate, cum et uestros infantes sic in sacro Baptismate susceptum, et complexurum esse ulnis misericordiæ suæ, et benedictionem uitæ æternæ, et sempiternam regni Dei com-

munionem eis collaturum, Hanc uobis fidem confirmet, et augeat idem Dominus, et Seruator noster Iesus Christus, Amen.

Post hæc Pastor manus super pueri caput imponet, et susceptores tangentes puerum, una cum eo orabunt.

Pater noster qui es in cœlis, &c.

Tum et symbolum recitabunt.

Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, &c.

Post hæc canet Ecclesia Psalmum CXIIII. *item* CXV. *et* CXXXVI. *In exitu Israhel. Non nobis. item, Laudate nomen Domini, Laudate serui Dominum.*

Pastor.—Dominus uobiscum.

Populus.—Et cum Spiritu tuo.

Oremus. Omnipotens et æterne Deus, Pater cœlestis, gratias agimus tibi æternas, quòd ad hanc agnitionem gratiæ tuæ, et fidei erga te nos uocare dignatus es, Auge et confirma hanc fidem in nobis perpetuo, Da huic infanti Spiritum sanctum tuum, quo regeneretur, et hæres fiat æternæ salutis, quam Ecclesiæ tuæ sanctæ, pueris simul et senibus propter Christum ex gratia et misericordia tua promisisti, per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, qui tecum uiuit et regnat nunc et in perpetuum, Amen. Fol. lxxiv. *vers.*

Ita Ecclesiam data benedictione dimittat.

De Administratione Baptismi.

Sequenti die infantes pridie exorcisati, iterum ad Ecclesiam sub officium cœnæ Domini adferantur, quos ibi Pastor post recitatum et enarratum Euangelium, et decantatum symbolum iubebit ad baptisterium exhiberi, et sequenti modo parentes, susceptores, et reliquos cognatos astantes, simul et uniuersam Ecclesiam adhortabitur.

Dilecti in Christo, hesterno die gratia Dei audiuimus, quàm immensa et ineffabilis misericordia in Baptismo exhibeatur. Satanæ et mundo renunciastis, fidem Christi estis confessi, et obedientiam Christo et Ecclesiæ promisistis, et petiistis à Deo Patre, ut propter Filium suum Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, infantes hos eripiat è regno tenebrarum, et constituat in regno Filii sui dilecti, Horum meminisse nos oportet, et non dubitare, nos hæc omnia, quæ petimus certo esse accepturos, si credimus. Tollentes ergo nunc mentes uestras ad Dominum, summa religione hic apparete, tanquàm in conspectu Dei omnipotentis, Patris, Filii, et Spiritus sancti, beneficiumq; regenerationis, atq; adoptionis in uitam æternam ab ipso uno Deo, et Seruatore nostro, Patre, Filio, et Spiritu sancto, certa fide et cum gratiarum actione excipite. Et quoniam ipse Dominus iussit baptizare nos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti, indubie ipse Deus noster infantes nostros baptizat, à peccatis emundat, ab æterna morte liberat, sua ipsius iustitia induit, et donat

Fol. lxxv. *rect.* æterna uita. Hæc immensa Dei beneficia uera fide agnoscenda nobis, et perpetuo celebranda sunt, Quare quò fidem, atq; animos nostros excitemus, audiamus hac de re uerba D. Pauli sequentia.

Ad Titum capite III.

At postquam bonitas, et erga homines amor apparuit Seruatoris nostri Dei, non ex operibus iusticiæ, quæ faciebamus nos, sed secundum misericordiam suam saluos nos fecit per lauacrum regenerationis, et renouationis Spiritus sancti, quem effudit in nos opulenter, per Iesum Christum Seruatorem nostrum, ut iustificati illius gratia, hæredes efficeremur iuxta spem uitæ æternæ, Indubitatus hic sermo est.

Pastor.—Dominus uobiscum.

Populus.—Et cum Spiritu tuo.

Ex Euangelio Matthei Capite ultimo.

Dixit Dominus Iesus discipulis, Data est mihi omnis potestas in cœlo, et in terra, Euntes ergo in uniuersum orbem, prædicate Euangelium omni creaturæ, et docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti, docentes eos seruare omnia, quæcunq; præcepi uobis. Qui crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit, saluus erit, qui uero non crediderit, condemnabitur, Et ecce ego uobiscum sum omnibus diebus usq; ad consummationem sæculi.

Pastor.—Dominus uobiscum.

Populus.—Et cum Spiritu tuo.

Oremus. Omnipotens et misericors Deus, et Pater, tu Abrahamo, nostro et omnium credentium patri, et in eo nobis quoq; filiis eius promisisti, te nobis et semini nostro uelle esse Deum. Quare ut infantes ueteris populi tui per Circumcisionem in gratiam, et in populum tuum recepisti, Et Filius tuus Christus Iesus, Dominus et Seruator noster, paruulos oblatos sibi clementer admodum admisit, et benedixit, testatus talium esse regnum cœlorum, Ita uoles nostros quoq; infantes regenerare, et adoptare tibi in filios, in consortium uitæ æternæ per Sacramentum Baptismatis. Da ergo cœlestis Pater, ut tantas diuitias gratiæ in Baptismo propositas, pro his infantulis ex animo petamus, et uerbo et Sacramento tuo oblatas uera fide agnoscamus, et excipiamus, perpetuo tibi pro his gratias agamus, et te celebremus. Et ne imputes his paruulis peccatum Adæ in eis per parentes propagatum, et innatum, neq; parentum ipsorum, et totius huius populi, sed ualeat in illis mors et meritum Filii tui Domini nostri Iesu Christi, et huius iusticiam atq; obedientiam eis imputa, Insere eos morti, et resurrectioni eius, Fac eos corporis eius membra, eo illos indue, ut filii et hæredes tui fiant, et perseuerent in æternum. Dona etiam nobis, ut post Baptismum, eos pro filiis tuis, et corporis Filii tui membris agnoscamus, in timore tui ad gloriam tuam pie educemus, in omnibus rebus corporalibus et spiri-

Fol. lxxv. *vers.*

tualibus adiuuemus, ut etiam per eos Nomen tuum sanctum magis celebretur, Regnum Filii tui propagetur, Voluntas tua in hac terra fiat, quemadmodum in cœlo. Ad hæc conserua eos incolumes, communica eis benigne necessaria uitæ, et custodi eos ab omni malo, per Christum Dominum nostrum, Amen.

Hac finita oratione iubeat Pastor sibi dari infantes, interroget nomina quæ imponi eis debeant, et baptiset eos dicens,

Baptizo te, N., in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti.

Mox susceptores infantem è Baptismo suscipiant, dicente Sacerdote ita ut sequitur.

Omnipotens æternus Deus, et Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, qui regenuit te aqua et Spiritu sancto, remisitq; tibi omnia peccata tua, confirmet te sua gratia, ad uitam æternam, Amen.

Pastor.—Pax Domini sit semper uobiscum.

Respond.—Amen.

Hic ab uniuersa Ecclesia cantetur Germanice, Grates nunc omnes &c., uel Psal. Deus misereatur nostri. Post pergat Pastor in officio Cœnæ Domini.

Qvomodo aliis temporibvs administrandvs Baptismvs sit.

Si autem infantuli infirmiore fuerint ualetudine, ut periculum sit, non uicturos esse uel ad proximum Dominicum, uel Festum diem, aut si propter grauiores causas illis diebus Baptismus conferri non possit, admonebunt Pastores populum, ut Baptizandos infantes suos, illis tamen horis adferre uelint, quibus de more Ecclesia ad uerbum Domini audiendum conuenit, Quod si neqúe istud fieri potest, Baptisma interim oblatis ad id infantibus negari non debet, quocumqùe tandem tempore adferantur. Nam committendum non est, quantum in nobis fuerit, ut absq; Baptismi Sacramento, ex hac uita ulli homines decedant, Quandoquidem Dominus instituit Baptisma, ut sit nobis Sacramentum regenerationis, et ablutionis peccatorum, à quibus nemo hominum in hac uita liber est, ne infans quidem unius diei. Nostrum enim est agere in omnibus rebus, secundum uerbum Domini, et dona et beneficia eius suscipere eo modo, et ratione, quam ipse nobis præscripsit. Fol. lxxvi. *rect.*

Quando ergo profestis diebus administrandum Baptisma fuerit, Pastores Catechismum, et Exorcismum, et Administrationem Baptismi ordine coniungant, et pro ratione cœtus, et ualetudine infantis modum adhibebunt adhortationum, et orationum. Si enim infantem uideant de uita periclitari, et cœtum exiguum adesse, breuibus omnia complectentur, Et primam modo partem ex admonitione, quam supra posuimus ante Catechismum præmittendam, usurpabunt ad ea usq; uerba. Quapropter dilecti hortor et obsecro, &c. Sic ex interrogationibus cuiusq; capitis primam tantum adhibebunt, Ita

in Exorcismo, unam modo precationem, cum oratione Dominica, Symbolo, et Euangelio, Quibus præmissis infantem statim baptizent, et parentes, susceptores, atq; alios astantes hortentur, ut certo statuant infantulum siue uiuat, siue mox moriatur, esse filium Dei, et hæredem uitæ æternæ, et ut ad pietatem, et Dei gloriam, si uita comes fuerit, rectè curent institui, iuxta adhortationem supra positam, quæ incipit,

Postquàm ergo dilecti, &c.

De Baptismo recens natis collato propter periculum uitæ.

Pro concionibus docendus et admonendus erit populus, ne facile diuinissimum hoc Sacramentum priuatim administrare præsumat. In Ecclesia enim et per suos Ministros summa grauitate, et religione administrari dignum est, idq; maxime interest ad id, ut salutariter dispensetur, et percipiatur, Sed si extrema necessitas urserit, tum
Fol. lxxvi. pers. qui adsunt periclitanti infantulo, iungant sese in Domino, pie sublatis ad Deum animis, misericordiam eius in Christo Domino nobis promissam et exhibitam super infantulo implorent, eumq; dicta oratione Dominica baptizent, In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. Quod cùm fecerint, ne dubitent infantem suum uere baptizatum, peccatis ablutum, in Christo renatum, et Filium hæredemq; Dei factum esse. Pro hoc ergo tanto Dei beneficio, gratias agant Deo, et ne putent Baptisma iterandum in pueris ita baptizatis. Quia in omnibus rebus, quoad licet, ad eam rationem agere debemus, quam Dominus præscripsit, si pius aliquis uir tum adfuerit, cùm infans extreme laborauerit, eius ministerio ad Baptismum utendum est.

Porrò si ita baptizatum domi infantem superuiuere contingat, deferri ad templum postea æquum est, à suis parentibus, cognatis, et susceptoribus, quos frequentes et religiosè adesse conuenit, ut qui gratias agere pro immenso hoc regenerationis beneficio infanti suo collato, et offerre eum Deo et Seruatori suo in Ecclesia debent. Hos ergo Pastores interrogabunt, qua ratione, et quibus uerbis infantem baptizarint, an ita ut præcepit Dominus, in aqua, et in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti. Qui si responderint se super infantem inuocasse Deum, rogasse pro illo, et in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti baptizasse, et credere se uere peccatis mundatum, et Deo renatum esse, Debent Pastores eos in hac fide confirmare, et infantem eiusmodi nequaquàm rebaptizare, Et ut homines magis consolentur, et tanti Sacramenti celebratio magis augeatur, et commendetur Christi beneficium per Baptismum in puerum collatum, comprobabunt id in Ecclesia, adhibita lectione sancti Euangelii, et precatione ad hunc modum.

Pastor, cum adfuerint qui talem infantem adferunt Domino, primum interrogabit eos.

Dilecti in Christo, Quandoquidem omnes in peccato et ira Dei nati simus rei æternæ mortis, atq; condemnationis, nec alia ratione consequi remissionem peccatorum, iustitiam, et uitam æternam possimus, quàm per fidem in Christum, Et his malis, mortis scilicet et iræ Dei, cum hic quoq; infans obnoxius natus sit, interrogo uos num Christo oblatus sit, eiq; per Baptismum insertus?

Si respondeant se ita credere, Interrogabit præterea, per quem hoc factum sit, et quibus præsentibus. Cumq; hos nominarint, rogabit eum, qui Baptizasse infantem dicetur, si adest, aut alios qui tum adfuerint, an inuocatum sit nomen Domini super eo, et habita oratio pro eo? Fol. lxxvii recto.

Vbi respondebunt et hoc factum esse. Rogabit, Quomodo baptizatus infans sit.

Si tum respondeant, In aqua, et cum hac uerborum forma, Baptizo te in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti. Postremum interrogabit.

An certo sciant se uerbo Dei rite usos esse, iuxta institutionem Domini, quod si respondeant se meminisse et scire.

Addat Pastor,

Qvandoquidem dilecti in Christo, omnia in nomine Dei, et iuxta institutum eius facta circa Baptisma huius infantis audio, in nomine Christi rectè uos fecisse pronuncio, Egent enim gratia Dei infantes, quam non denegat eis Seruator noster Christus, ubicumque illa pueris iuxta uerbum eius petitur, nec enim alligauit beneficium redemptionis suæ ullis locis, temporibus, uel personis, Nam quocumque in loco credentes ipsi in eius nomine conueniunt, medius ipse illis adest, et inuocatus fide efficax est, in uerbo et Sacramentis suis, atqúe præstat solide, quicquid Sacramentis suis offert, et uerbis suis pollicetur. Ad confirmandam uero hanc fidem, et ad excitandum nos ad gratias agendas Domino, pro tanto eius beneficio, quod huic infantulo per Baptisma collatum est, audiamus ex Euangelio, quomodo Dominus uelit infantes sibi adferri, et benigne benedicere sibi oblatis.

Marci X.

Et attulerunt ad illum pueros, ut tangeret illos, Discipuli uero increpabant eos, qui adducebant. Cùm uidisset autem Jesus indignatus est, et dixit illis, Sinite pueros uenire ad me, nec prohibete illos, talium enim est regnum cœlorum. Amen dico uobis, Quicumq; non acceperit regnum Dei tanquàm puer, haudquaquam ingredietur in illud. Et cum cœpisset [cepisset] in ulnas, impositis manibus super illos benedixit eis.

Ex his ergo Christi uerbis certi sumus infantes, quicumq; Christo

iuxta Verbum eius offeruntur, pertinere ad regnum Dei, esse Filios Dei, membra Christi, his angelos adesse ministros, et subiectam ad inseruiendum eis omnem creaturam mundi. Quare singulari studio ministrare talibus, ut in Christo rite educentur, et grandescant oportet, quicumq; Christi sunt, quibus illos Dominus peculiariter copulauit, quales uos parentes, cognati, susceptores, et alii necessarii, atque
Fol. lxxvii. vers. omnes, qui de huius nostræ Ecclesiæ corpore estis. Hunc igitur uobis infantulum, filium et hæredem Dei, fratrem et cohæredem Christi, membrum Christi, et uestrum in Christo, fidei uestræ et curæ in Domino committo et commendo, ut eum Domino, in quem renatus est, et Regno Dei, in quod renatus est, quàm diligentissime fouendum, educandum, instituendum curetis, quisque pro sua uocatione et facultate, ut ubi primum per ætatem poterit, discat seruare, quæcumque Christus seruanda nobis præcepit. Quare uobis parentibus, cognatis, et susceptoribus præcipuè incumbit (quamquam ad id et cæteri omnes, qui in hac Ecclesia uiuunt, et ad quoscunq; uenerit Christianos, suam operam et opem conferre debeant) efficere, ut hic infans Dei, ubi primum per ætatem liceat, ad Scholam et Ecclesiam deducatur, et Dei mysteriis ibi summa fide instituatur, quo amplissima Dei beneficia in Baptismo percepta agnoscere discat, et celebrare, Vt deinde in Ecclesia fidem suam ipse profiteatur, Satanæ et mundo cum omnibus eius illecebris et operibus, sua ipsius uoce coram uniuersa Ecclesia Dei renunciet, Christo et Ecclesiæ sese in omnem obedientiam addicat, et in ea ad finem usq; perseueret, ut uiuum Christi membrum, et palmes in Christo manens, fructum adferens copiosum, ad laudem et gloriam Dei, ædificationemq; Ecclesiæ eius.

Post hæc subiiciat imposita manu infanti.

Dominus uobiscum.

Respon. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Oremus. Domine Deus Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, qui regenuisti hunc infantem ex aqua et Spiritu sancto, et peccatorum omnium remissionem ei sacrosancto Baptismate contulisti, confirma hunc tua gratia, et regas prouehasq; hanc nouam uitam, quam donasti, et perficias eam, ad quam infantem sacro hoc Sacramento obsignasti, Da etiam parentibus ipsius, et nobis omnibus, ut in eo curando fideliter et diligenter tibi inseruiamus, ut per ipsum et nos omnes indies magis sanctificetur nomen tuum, ac regnum tuum promoueatur, ad plenam usq; perfruitionem fœlicitatis, per Christum Dominum nostrum, Amen.

Si uero ii qui infantem offerunt, non satis constanter respondere possunt ad dictas interrogationes, adeo ut fateantur se haud satis
Fol. lxxviii. recto. scire, quid cogitarint, aut fecerint baptizando, perturbati scilicet præ-

senti periculo, ut fieri non raro solet, tunc omissa anxia disputatione, Pastor talem infantem nondum baptizatum iudicet, et ea omnia perficiat, quæ ad istam actionem pertinent, qualia supra descripta sunt, admonitionem, et Catechismum ad eos qui infantem adferunt, Exorcismum infantis, communem confessionem fidei, et cætera omnia, quibus peractis baptizet infantem, et citra conditionem, In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti.

De Confirmatione baptizatorvm, et solemni professione fidei in Christum, atq; obedientiæ Christo et Ecclesiæ eius præstandæ.

Et in ueteri, et in nouo Testamento mos hic obseruatus est ex instituto Dei, ut qui prima infantia recepti essent in gratiam Domini, apud ueteres per Circuncisionem, in nouo populo per Baptisma, ubi primum acceptum hoc Dei beneficium cognouissent, et fidem in Deum solidam concepissent, ipsi fidem suam in Ecclesia profiterentur, et se ipsi obedientiæ Dei atq; Ecclesiæ addicerent. Ad quam confessionem fidei, et obedientiæ in Ecclesia professionem, confirmari etiam in religione ab Ecclesia solenniter solebant, per orationem et aliquod diuinæ corroborationis Symbolum, quod sub Mose certis sacrificiis constabat, et oblationibus, Florente Euangelio, impositione manuum, et communione Cœnæ Domini. Est enim hæc ueræ uiuæq; fidei natura, ut quisq; singularia Dei beneficia sibi præstita cupiat prædicare, et celebrare, seseq; Deo inuicem ad glorificandum nomen eius, omni officio pietatis offerre, et consecrare. Vnde Psal. XXII. canit. De te laus mea in Ecclesia magna, in medio Ecclesiæ laudabo te. Et Psal. XXXV. Confitebor tibi in Ecclesia magna, in populo frequenti laudabo te.

Deinde per Baptisma Christo inserti, et corporis eius, id est, Ecclesiæ facti membra, et ita reliquis Christi membris in Christo coniuncti et addicti sumus, ut omnibus, quibuscum aliqua nobis inciderit uitæ consuetudo, aut ulla officiorum communicatio, inseruire debeamus, præcipuè quidem ad omnem pietatem et religionem, Deinde autem etiam ad huius uitæ præsentis necessitatem, ut singuli scilicet nos inuicem agnoscamus, et syncera charitate complectamur in Christo, et primum docceamus, moneamus, corrigamus, consolemur, adhortemur in his, quæ sunt nouæ uitæ in Christo. Deinde etiam adiuuemus nos inuicem in rebus uitæ præsentis, consilio, opera, et opere. Hæc itaq; uitæ utriusq; in Christo Domino communio, et officiorum uicissitudo poscit, ut quisque se ipse quoq; Ecclesiæ Christi ad hanc interni et externi hominis societatem, et officiorum communicationem palam offerat et dedat. Cùm igitur hæc fidei confessio, et in obedientiam atque communicationem Christi et Ecclesiæ, propria consecratio, et deditio, Fol. lxxviii. *vers.*

quam ipsa fidei natura, et necessitas huius communicationis Christi poscit, In Baptismo fieri non possit, cùm baptizantur infantes, necesse est, ut ea ab iis, qui in infantia baptizati fuerint, fiat, cum ipsa de religione utcunq; instituti fuerint, et summa illa beneficia in Baptismo collata, aliquantulum intellexerint.

Quando uero hi fidem suam et obedientiam coram Ecclesia solenniter profitentur, rursus ipsum fidei ingenium postulat, ut Ecclesia pro eis preces solenniter fundat, et incrementa eis oret Spiritus sancti, ut in fide Christi, et obedientia Ecclesiæ, eos ipse confirmare, conseruare, atque in omnem ueritatem perpetuò inducere uelit. Cumq; huiusmodi oratio facta in nomine Christi, et fiducia promissionum eius, non possit non efficax esse, ad ministerium Ecclesiæ pertinet, eos pro quibus Ecclesia orauit, confirmatione Spiritus sancti corroborare. Ad hanc itaq; ueteres, Christi et Apostolorum exemplum imitati, symbolum adbihuerunt impositionis manuum.

Hæc igitur ceremonia fide Christi obseruata, quia indubiè fidei et charitatis Christianæ officium est, modis omnibus, uerbis, et institutis Domini consentanea, et certæ ædificationis in Religione Christi, uolumus eam in pium et salutarem usum in Ecclesia restitui, submotis omnibus abusibus, qui in locum huius Ceremoniæ inuaserunt, qui quàm fuerint fœdi et noxii nostræ religioni, cuiuis Christiano facile iudicare est.

Hactenus ministerium hoc Confirmationis peculiare opus fuit Suffraganei, Cæterum cum in Ecclesia omnia ad communem Christianorum utilitatem referri, institui, et fieri debeant, uolumus deinceps hoc Confirmationis ministerium, si per Suffraganeum commode administrari non posset, aut non ita ut oportet administraretur, per uisitatores fieri, duabus per annum uicibus, in præcipuis solemnitatibus. Cùm enim initio solis Episcopis commendaretur munus confirmandi, Episcopatus tàm ampli non erant, quàm nunc sunt, nec enim diocæses ampliores erant, quàm ut Episcopi singulas parochias per annum semel uisitare, et Catechizatos pueros ipsi audire et confirmare possent. At nunc multo aliter se res habet, et longe alia ratio est Episcopatuum, ita ut uni Episcopo, aut Suffraganeo in tota Diocæsi sua iusto tempore administrare hanc Confirmationem impossibile sit. In Ecclesiis enim singulis adolescunt quotannis aliqui, quos fidem suam profiteri, et Confirmari solenniter deceat. Quare cum singulæ Ecclesiæ opus habeant annua inspectione et uisitatione, etiam eorum qui eo ætate et cognitione Christi promouerunt, solenni professione fidei, et Confirmatione ipsa, nos necessaria procuratio gregis Dominici nobis crediti cogit, ut prouideamus, ne Ecclesiis idoneum ad hæc ministerium desit. Nec enim personis ministrorum salus ouium Christi, sed saluti harum personæ seruire debent ministrorum, ut omnia fiant iuxta illud. Omnia uestra sunt siue Paulus, siue Apollo, siue Cephas. 1 Corinth. iii.

Fol. lxxix. *recl.*

Et teste Hieronymo non ideo Confirmatio hæc propria quondam Episcoporum functio fuit, quòd aliis eam administrare non liceret, cum Baptismum Sacramentum longe præstantius, uulgares etiam ministri, imo quilibet Christianus, si ordinarii Ministri deessent, administrare possit. Sed ea de causa Episcopis peculiariter commendata fuit, ut Episcopi singularum Ecclesiarum, quæ cuiq; creditæ essent, certiorem assequerentur noticiam, et curam magis salutarem gererent, dum ipsi singulis annis cognoscerent, qua fide et diligentia Pastores cum reliquos, tum præcipue pueritiam Christi instituerent.

Ad maiorem etiam religionis consensionem, et erga Sacrum ministerium reuerentiam, atq; obedientiam conseruandam faciebat, cum unusquisq; fidem suam, et obedientiam Christi uni Episcopo profiteretur.

Cum autem tam multæ Ecclesiæ curæ unius Episcopi concreditæ sint, ut per unum Episcopum uel Suffraganeum inspici singulæ quotannis non queant, necesse sane est, hoc inspectionis et Confirmationis munus, quod ultra annum differri sine grandi Ecclesiarum incommodo, et religionis periculo non potest, curare perficiendum opera plurium, dum nequit per unum.

In singulis tamen Ecclesiis Parochi una cum Symmystis suis, aliquot diebus ante aduentum Visitatorum, pueros, quos Confirmationi offerre statuerint, ad confessionem fidei, et professionem Christianæ communicationis et obedientiæ decenter faciendam, diligenter præparabunt, Quæ ad hunc modum ab eis facienda est. Fol. lxxix. *vers.*

Interrogatio.—Profiteris te Christianum ?

Respond.—Profiteor.

Interrogatio.—Quid est esse Christianum ?

Respond.—In Christo renatum esse, et habere per eum remissionem peccatorum, et Communicationem uitæ æternæ.

Interrogatio.—Vnde confidis tibi hæc esse collata ?

Respond.—Quòd Baptizatus sum in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti.

Interrogatio.—Quid credis de Deo Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu sancto ?

Respond.—Hoc quod articuli symboli nostri complectuntur.

Interrogatio.—Recita illos.

Respond.—Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem &c.

Hic puer articulos Symboli omnes clare et distincte recitet.

Interrogatio.—Quid intelligis dum inquis, Credo in Deum Patrem, in Filium, et Spiritum sanctum ?

Respond.—Tres esse personas unius essentiæ, potentiæ, et unum tamen Deum.

Interrogatio.—Cur inquis Deum omnipotentem, et Creatorem cœli et terræ ?

Respond.—Quia credo, quòd Deus, ut omnia ita et me ipsum ex nihilo creauit, per unicum Filium suum Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, et per eundem solum conseruat, atq; gubernat, ubiq; præsto adest, et operatur omnia bona in omnibus, solo suo semper sapienti consilio, et iusta uoluntate.

Interrogatio.—Quo pacto intelligis secundum articulum de Christo Domino nostro?

Respond.—Agnosco ex eo naturam nostram lapsu Adæ adeo corruptam esse, ut nullus nec Angelorum, nec hominum expiare peccata nostra, et satisfacere pro eis potuerit, adeo ut necesse fuerit uerbum æternum Filium Dei fieri hominem, conceptum de Spiritu sancto, natum ex Maria uirgine, uerum quidem hominem, sed sine peccato, qui morte sua satisfecit pro peccatis nostris, et resurrectione atq; ascensione sua in cœlos, collocauit nos secum in cœlestibus, cui Pater omnem dedit potestatem in cœlis et terris, ut regat nos, restituat in nobis imaginem suam, et tandem, cùm suo tempore uenerit ad iudicandum uiuos et mortuos, resuscitet à mortuis, et ad imaginem suam
Fol. lxxx. *rect.* perfecte reformatos, donet adire hereditatem æternæ fœlicitatis in cœlis, alios uero, qui ipsum pertinaciter contempserint, tradat puniendos igni æterno.

Interrogatio.—Quæ est sententia tertii articuli?

Resp.—Hæc est, quòd Christus Dominus donauerit nobis Spiritum sanctum, qui per ministerium Euangelii credentes in Ecclesiam suam congregat, in qua excitari perpetuo debent ad pœnitentiam, et fidem, et accipere remissionem peccatorum, per uerbum Dei, et Sacramenta Communionis Christi, ac ita bona conscientia uiuendo uitam piam, sanctam, et utilem proximis, expectare Christum Seruatorem, qui eos ex hoc sæculo ad se assumat in cœlos, et corpora quoque eorum in die iudicii ad uitam cœlestem resuscitet.

Interrogatio.—Credis ergo hæc omnia firmiter?

Resp.—Credo omnia, oro autem Dominum, ut hanc fidem augere in me dignetur.

Interrogatio.—Quid autem debet hæc fides in te efficere?

Resp.—Vt nihil dubitem Deum, & Patrem Domini nostri Iesu Christi, qui nobis cum hoc suo Filio misit uerbum suum, et donauit omnia, esse solum uerum Deum, condidisse omnia ex nihilo, solum efficere, et largiri bona omnia, ac uelle et mihi se Patrem præstare, propter eundem Filium suum Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, abluisse me à peccatis Sacro Baptismate, donasse Spiritu Sancto, Filio suo dilecto incorporasse, atq; ita in Ecclesiam suam assumpsisse, et in filium atq; hæredem adoptasse, conseruaturum etiam esse in Ecclesia sua, pœnitentiam et remissionem in ea daturum, Communionemq; Filii sui, ut per eum nomen ipsius filiali fiducia semper

inuocem, et innouatione mei ad imaginem eius quotidie proficiam, per uerbum, et Sacramenta in me perpetuo confirmaturum, et aucturum, quo sanctificare nomen ipsius, et inseruire Ecclesiæ eius omni genere bonorum operum indesinenter studeam, donec me ex hoc sæculo ad cœlestia gaudia, et beatam resurrectionem assumat. Quæ omnia præstita mihi agnosco, et præstanda ex sola gratuita misericordia Patris cœlestis, et inæstimabili merito Filii sui Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

Interrogatio.—Hanc tibi fidem augeat, et confirmet Deus, et Pater noster cœlestis, per Filium suum Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, Amen. Sentis igitur te, et agnoscis in hac fide uerè filium esse, et hæredem Dei, fratrem et cohæredem Domini nostri Iesu Christi, ac ideo etiam unum membrum corporis sui, quod est Ecclesia?

Respond.—Sentio et agnosco fretus certissimis diuinæ beneuolentiæ promissionibus, et merito Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

Interrogatio.—Ergo placet tibi, ratumq; habes, et adiutus Spiritu Domini in eo perseuerabis, quod tui susceptores nomine tuo ad Sacrum Baptisma promiserunt et professi sunt, cum pro te renunciarunt Satanæ, et mundo, et addixerunt te Christo et Ecclesiæ eius in solidam Euangelii obedientiam? Fol. lxxx. *vers.*

Respond.—Hæc rata habeo, et in eis adiuuante me Domino nostro Iesu Christo permanebo usq; ad finem.

Interrogatio.—Et nunc ipse etiam tuo corde et ore hic in conspectu Dei, et coram sancta eius Ecclesia, renuncias Satanæ et cunctis operibus eius?

Respond.—Renuncio.

Interrogatio.—Et mundo atq; cunctis concupiscentiis eius?

Respond.—Renuncio.

Interrogatio.—Et tradis te atq; consecras in omnem obedientiam Christo et Sanctæ Ecclesiæ eius?

Respond.—Trado me et consecro.

Interrogatio.—Quomodo es primum à Deo in filium adoptatus, et in Ecclesiam eius assumptus?

Respond.—Per S. Baptisma.

Interrogatio.—Quid est Baptisma?

Respond.—Lauacrum regenerationis, quo à peccato ablutus, et Christo Domino insertus sum, et eo indutus.

Interrogatio.—Vis in hac communione Christi perseuerare usque in finem?

Respond.—Volo equidem fretus auxilio Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

Interrogatio.—Quid requirit ista communio Ecclesiæ Christi?

Respond.—Vt permaneam in doctrina hac, quam confessus sum, et in omnibus articulis fidei nostræ, credamq; remissionem me habere peccatorum in Christo Domino, et propter hunc Filium dilectum, non

proprio merito iusticiæ esse iustificatum, et acceptum Deo hæredemq; uitæ æternæ, Tum uiuere etiam studeam secundum omnia placita Dei. Atq; quo in hac agnitione Dei, et obedientia proficiam ut uerbum Dei præcipue autem diebus Festis et Dominicis, à Ministris Ecclesiæ diligenter audiam, et si Presbyteri Ecclesiæ, aut alii, quicunq; hoc mihi dilectionis officium præstiterint, arguant peccati, ut id boni consulam, et ad uitæ emendationem suscipiam, et ego proximos meos itidem, quos male et inordinate se gerere uidero, ex syncero studio Christi, et salutis ipsorum moneam, et emendem, si liceat, sin minus, ut alios
Fol. lxxxi. *recto.* adhibeam, quos sperauero plus effecturos apud illos, quòd si neq; hos audierint, ut ad Presbyteros Ecclesiarum rem omnem deferam, quos s audire contempserint, ac propterea excommunicati fuerint, ut eos habeam pro Ethnicis et publicanis, eorumq; consuetudinem uitem, quantum feret uocatio nostra, et coniunctio cum ipsis ciuilis, et necessitas ipsorum secundum uerbum Dei.

Interrogatio.—Quid amplius requirit communio Ecclesiæ Christi?

Respond.—Requirit etiam, ut cum reliquis Christianis, ad quoscunq; uenero, uel apud quos habitauero, communicem Cœnæ Domini, ut cum quibus unus panis, et unum corpus sim in Christo.

Interrogatio.—Quid est hoc Sacramentum?

Respond.—Est communicatio corporis et sanguinis Christi quæ nobis in cœna Domini, cum illa iuxta institutum Domini celebratur, cum pane et uino uerè exhibentur.

Interrogatio.—In quem usum sumis corpus et sanguinem Domini?

Respond.—Vt fides mea in ipsum, et fiducia noui et æterni Testamenti, gratiæ Dei, redemptionis Christi, atq; Communionis cum ipso, magis ac magis in me confirmetur, et minus mihi, sed magis in ipso uiuam, et ipse in me uitam nouam et sanctam instauret, Nam quod ad meam carnem et sanguinem attinet, nihil quàm peccare, et impiam agere uitam possum.

Interrogatio.—Quid præterea requirit communio Ecclesiæ?

Respond.—Vt ad publicas Ecclesiæ preces, meas studiose addam, conueniam, et ibi oblationes, et eleemosinas liberaliter conferam in usus pauperum, sicq; in omnibus me geram, uti membrum Christi, in Christo coniunctum, et cohærens cum piis omnibus, eosq; quos Dominus Ecclesiis suis Pastores, curatores animarum, et presbyteros præfecerit, in omnibus libenter agnoscam, et colam, sicut decet filium Dei, Deo morigerum, et gratum esse pro immensis istis beneficiis, Euangelio, et communione Filii eius Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

Interrogatio.—Vis autem hæc omnia bona fide præstare, et obseruare, quemadmodum iam professus es?

Respond.—Volo, fretus auxilio Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

Postquam uero unus ex pueris confessionem fidei pleniorem recitauerit, et obedientiam Christi plenius professus fuerit coram omni Ecclesia, satisfuerit pueros cæteros interrogare ordine, isto modo.

Interrogatio.—Credis et confiteris et tu fili, ac uis te tradere et consecrare in communionem et obedientiam Christi et Ecclesiæ eius, ita ut modo audiuisti istum puerum credere, et confessum esse, sese Christo et Ecclesiæ Christi in obedientiam Euangelii addixisse ? Fol. lxxxi. *vers.*

Hic satis erit pro se singulos respondere, ita.

Credo, Confiteor, et me Christo et Ecclesiæ eius consecro, fretus gratia et ope Domini et Seruatoris nostri Iesu Christi.

Vbi uero non fuerint pueri tam exercitati in Religionis cognitione, ut ad formam præscriptam respondere memoriter possint, debet Visitator, qui Confirmationem administrabit, talibus pueris responsiones omnes prælegere, et satis erit, si simplici responsione prælecta se credere testati fuerint, ita tamen declarare eis omnia studebit, ut intelligant, quid ibi agatur, et quid confiteantur, et profiteantur. Monendi tamen diligenter sunt, ut cogitent se stare in conspectu Dei, quem fallere non possint, qui cor intuetur. Quare summa religione curandum eis, ut uita ipsa declarent, quod ore profitentur, et corde sentiunt.

Singuli tamen pueri, ut ante monuimus, septimana præcedenti, per Ministros et Seniores cuiusq; Ecclesiæ, exerceri ad hæc debent, et diligenter explorari, et Pastores et Presbyteri nullos pueros confirmandos Visitatori sistere debent, nisi de quibus confidant, quod summam Religionis teneant, et Christo uere credant. Vt scite respondeant pueri, quòd ad uerba attinet, non est anxie requirendum, nec enim raro fit, ut qui scientia fidei instructiores sint, uel pudore, uel alia imbecillitate animi impediti, quæ piè sentiunt, minus commode ualeant eloqui, præsertim in publico. Quare magis spectandum, qui pueri, quæ Religionis sunt, uere intelligant, quàm qui ualeant ea uerbis scite expiicare, qua in re ii sæpe præstant, qui animos minus pietate imbutos habent. Porrò cùm pueri confirmandi, fidem suam confessi fuerint, et Euangelii obedientiam professi, Ecclesia admonenda est, ut pro his pueris Deum suppliciter oret, Cuius orationem Pastor huiusmodi Collecta Domino offeret.

Collecta.

Omnipotens et misericors Deus, Pater cœlestis, qui solus in nobis efficis, ut uelimus ac perficiamus, quæ tibi placita sunt, ac uere bona, rogamus te pro his pueris, quos Ecclesiæ tuæ donasti, atque tibi Sacro Baptismate regenuisti, quibusq; eam lucem infudisti, ut gratiam et beneficia tua erga se, redemptionem suam in Christo Iesu, et agnoscere, et coram Ecclesia confiteri, seq; ipsi tibi, et Ecclesiæ tuæ in obedientiam præceptorum tuorum dedere et consecrare uoluerint. Confirma hoc Fol. lxxxii. *recto.*

opus tuum quod in eis operatus es, auge ipsis donum Spiritus tui, ut in Ecclesia tua agnitione et obedientia Euangelii tui semper proficientes, ad finem usq; perseuerent, neq; unquam peruersa aliqua doctrina seducti, uel cupiditatibus carnis impulsi, ab ea fide et Euangelii obedientia, quam confessi modo et professi sunt, uspiam declinent, Largire eis, ut in Filio tuo Domino nostro Iesu Christo, communi omnium nostrum capite, fœliciter adolescentes, crescant in eum, donec perueniant ad plene uirilem et perfectam ætatem, in omni sapientia, sanctitate, atq; iustitia, ut te Patrem, et Filium tuum Dominum nostrum cum Spiritu sancto semper plenius cognoscant, ardentius diligant, et coram proximis suis, et uerbis, et omni uita sua grauius et efficacius confiteantur, celebrent, atq; glorificent, Et quemadmodum nobis pollicitus es, quicquid petierimus à te in nomine Filii tui dilecti, te hoc nobis daturum esse, et sicut Filius tuus promisit te nobis rogantibus spiritum bonum multo promptius daturum esse, quàm Patrem quemuis inter nos bonum aliquod rogantibus filiis suis, ita tribue his tuis pueris, quod te per Christum Filium tuum rogamus, ut cum illis modo in tuo nomine manus imponemus, et per hoc signum certos eos reddemus, paternam manum tuam semper fore super eos extentam, Spiritum sanctum tuum, qui eos in uia salutis, in uita uere Christiana conseruet, ducat, et regat, nunquam defuturum, Tribue inquam tu eis, ut hæc uera fide agnoscant, et certo credant te ipsos omnipotenti dextera tua semper protecturum, et ab omni malo custoditurum, et liberaturum, et ad omne bonum ducturum et perducturum, tuumq; Sanctum Spiritum ab eis nunquam ablaturum, per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, Amen.

Hic Pastor impositis super eos manibus dicet.

Domine Iesu Christe Fili Dei, qui in Euangelio dixisti, Si uos igitur cùm sitis mali, nostis dona bona dare filiis uestris, quanto magis Pater dabit Spiritum sanctum petentibus se? Item, si duo consenserint in terra de omni re, quamcunq; petierint, fiet illis à Patre meo cœlesti, Confirma hunc seruum tuum N. Spiritu sancto tuo, ut in obedientia Euangelii tui perseueret, Diabolo et propriæ infirmitati fortiter resistat, neq; contristet Spiritum sanctum, aut scandalis perturbet, uel offendat Ecclesiam tuam, sed ut tota eius uita ad laudem gloriæ tuæ, propriam salutem, et communem Ecclesiæ tuæ utilitatem, tota deseruiat, quemadmodum nobis præcepisti, et daturum te rogantibus pollicitus es, Amen.

Fol. lxxxii. b. [illegible]

Post hæc canatur Hymnus, Grates nunc omnes &c.

In Confirmatione pridem signum olei adhiberi consueuit, uerum quoniam hoc signo superstitiosissimè abusi sunt, et apud Christianos non tam signa et umbræ Spiritualium rerum, quam res et ueritas spectari

et ualere debet, satisfuerit in ista actione Symbolum impositionis manuum, quod et Apostolis atq; antiquioribus Patribus satisfuit.

Vt uero Ceremonia hæc maiore grauitate et religione, et uberiore fructu, cum puerorum, tum totius Ecclesiæ peragatur, Decani cum Visitatoribus aut Parochis singularum Ecclesiarum talem aliquem locum in templis ad istam Ceremoniam ministrandam deligent, unde confessio et professio puerorum, et reliqua, quæ cum illis agenda sunt, à tota Ecclesia clare exaudiri et intelligi possint.

ADDENDA, &c.

P. 85. It may be worth while to give an illustration of what is here referred to. Thus, then, we find Bishop Hooper quoted as an opponent of the Calvinistic view of election, because he has said in his Preface to his "Declaration of the Ten Commandments," that "The cause of rejection or damnation is sin in man, which will not hear, neither receive the promise of the Gospel." Now this might fairly be adduced against the notion that it was not sin, but God's decree, that caused man's damnation; but it does not touch the question of the cause of election; and in the context of this very passage, Bishop Hooper tells us, "The cause of our election is *the mercy of God in Christ*, Rom. ix. Howbeit he that will be partaker of this election must receive the promise in Christ by faith. For *therefore* we be elected, *because afterward* we are made the members of Christ. Eph. i.; Rom viii." (Works P. S. ed. p. 264.) That is, he maintains that it is God's mercy, not foreseen holiness, that is the cause of our election. Bishop Hooper's views have been similarly misrepresented on other points by giving extracts from his writings, adverse to certain extreme views on the subject of the Divine Decrees, as showing his adherence to what is now called Arminian doctrine. But I must content myself with putting the reader on his guard against such misconceptions of the views of our early divines, as it would occupy considerable space to notice them at length.

Pp. 107 and 274. In giving the names of the Regius Professors of Divinity at Cambridge, I have followed Le Neve in his "Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, 1716," fol., (a work of the highest reputation); whose list is, I understand, borne out by the University Register. John Fox, however, in his "Acts and Monuments," (ed. 1583, p. 1966,) tells us, that, at the restoration of the bones of Bucer and Paul Fagius

to an honourable burial, "M. James Pilkinton the Queenes reader of the Divinity Lecture, going up into the pulpite, made a sermon upon the iii. Psalme," &c. His case, if he is to be added to the list, only affords further evidence of the correctness of the view already deduced from the works of his contemporaries as to the theology of our Church at that period; both as it respects its general character, and its nature on the particular subject of baptism.

For the former, the following passage may suffice.

"And why will God thus save them? for any goodness in them, which had so long forgotten him and his house; or for their good works who had so long been so disobedient? No; but even 'because I have chosen thee, saith the Lord.' This is the first and chiefest cause, why he bestoweth his goodness upon any people; even *because he hath chosen them in Christ afore the world was made:* and *for this cause he continueth bestowing his blessing to the end, upon them whom he hath once chosen.* . . . . . 'I have chosen you, and ye have not chosen me,' said Christ to his disciples and apostles. And as he thus chose them, so he chooses all which be chosen: and so he will declare his free grace, love, and mercy, to all which be his, *freely, even because it pleased him to choose them,* and they deserved not to be chosen of him, but rather to be cast away from him." (Expos. upon Aggeus, Ch. 2, ver. 20—23. Works, P. S. ed. pp. 194, 195.)

For the latter (if any is necessary after the passage just cited), we may take the following observations on the Sacraments:—

"Under this name of a seal, he commendeth unto us also both his outward visible Sacraments, and the inward grace of the Holy Ghost, working *in our consciences* by them. St. Paul calleth circumcision (a Sacrament of the old law) 'the seal of the righteousness of faith:' and as that was a seal in that time to our fathers of righteousness, so be our Sacraments to us in these days seals of God's promises unto us, and *all have one strength and virtue.* The Scripture of God is the indenture betwixt God and us, wherein is contained both the promises, grace, and mercy, that God offereth to the world in his Son Christ, and also the conditions which he requires to be fulfilled in our behalf: the Sacraments are the seals set to his indenture, *to strengthen our faith,* that we do not doubt. For as it is not enough to write the conditions of a bargain in an indenture, except it be sealed; so God for our weakness thought it not sufficient to make us promise of his blessings in writing in his Scripture: but he would seal it with his own blood, and institute his Sacraments as seals of the same truth, to remain to be received of us *in remembrance of him and strengthening our faith.*" (Ib. p. 192.)

P. 209. l. 6. The necessity of consulting the works of our early divines to ascertain what is the true meaning of their Formularies (the principle here contended for), is thus distinctly acknowledged by Bishop Bethell: "Several solutions have been proposed in order to get rid of this discordance between the language of our own Church, and the opinions of some Churchmen. *But in the meantime it seems to have been forgotten, that the true sense of these compositions must be ascertained by investigating their genealogy, and endeavouring to discover the opinions of their compilers, and the principles on which they were really constructed.*" (Bp. Bethell's Gen. View of doctr. of Regen. in Baptism. 4th ed. 1845. pp. 98, 99.)

Notice of Archdeacon Wilberforce's Answer to the preceding Work.

While this sheet was passing through the press, Archdeacon Wilberforce's Answer to the preceding Work has been placed in my hands. It is, of course, impossible for me to do much more here than to state my intention of replying to it at as early a period as my other engagements will permit. I avail myself, however, of the opportunity just to notice one or two, out of several like, points, which have struck me in the course of a rapid glance through it. The Work commences with as singular a mistake as can easily be found. Mr. Scott has justly stated, that "the question whether spiritual regeneration is, or is not, inseparable from baptism," has not "any necessary connexion with the doctrines of absolute predestination, and indefectible grace;" justly, because many Arminians deny that it is. But this assertion the Archdeacon strangely metamorphoses into an assertion, that "the theory of Calvin and the doctrine of Baptismal Grace are not so practically irreconcileable, that those who adhere to the one must forego the other;" and finding that my Work maintains that Calvinism and the doctrine that spiritual regeneration is inseparable from baptism are irreconcileable, he thus concludes, "Thus does he [Mr. Goode] take for granted, as the very basis of his position, that which Mr. Scott had so emphatically denied." (pp. 2, 3.) This is but an unpromising commencement; especially when we find the Archdeacon himself telling us in p. 179, that "a belief that any gifts of grace are bestowed where there is no certainty of salvation, is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the theory of Calvin;" a statement which of itself answers a considerable portion of his volume, and is a stronger statement than I have ever made, or think consistent with fact. But then again, towards the close of his Work, in direct contradiction to this, the Archdeacon spends some 20 pages in proving that certain "Calvinists" did hold the doctrine of invariable spiritual regeneration in infant baptism, referring to Davenant, Ward, and even Usher (!) as testifying against me,

concluding in triumph that "Mr. Goode is utterly put out of Court by his own witnesses." (p. 292.) Of course the Archdeacon is "put out" also, at the same time, and by himself. And the Archdeacon's triumph will be very short with one who consults the writings of the parties he has named. But he seems to have no idea of the essential difference of their views from his own system. As to Usher, it is difficult to conceive how he could venture to name him for such a purpose. The view of Davenant, as stated in his letter to Ward (and this is what the Archdeacon alludes to) every reader of my Work knows that I have given fully, and I think I have sufficiently shown its uselessness for proving what the Archdeacon would derive from it. But what will the reader say when I inform him, that the Archdeacon actually represents the matter as if I had concealed it, and writes thus, "The reader will see that on these facts it would not be difficult to found a charge of disingenuous conduct against Mr. Goode. *Why not tell his readers plainly the purpose of Davenant's letter?* Why not state more fully the sentiments of Dr. Ward, &c." (p. 272). And he then takes credit for *not* implying such an imputation, adding a note of reproof for *my* speaking of the disingenuousness of the Tractarian party! And in several passages in other parts, he complains as if I had not spoken with sufficient respect of Archbishop Laurence, &c. I certainly am not aware that such is the case. The charge against the Tractarian party is too well founded to permit me to withdraw it. But one thing I would earnestly press upon the Archdeacon's attention, that before he, at least, indulges in criticism of this kind, he must expunge from his own book insinuations that his opponents *use expressions which they disbelieve, and promise to teach a system which they intend to contradict,* &c. (p. 55, 6.) when he well knows, that they believe and teach what in their minds is the true meaning of the language as much as himself. Such language is reprehensible in the highest degree, but nevertheless but too common in the mouths of many of those who think with him.

In p. 264, I find the following statement,—"He finds the system of Calvinism not only in Abbot and Downame, but in Andrews and Hooker." (p. 264.) The fact is just the reverse as to Andrews, who is mentioned and quoted as opposed to it. (See pp. 114, 115, of first ed. 125, 126, 2d. ed.)

The Archdeacon informs his readers that Mr. Goode "opens his historical statements with the startling assertion that Peter Lombard is on his side, and that in the blooming period of the Scholastic philosophy it was an open question whether 'grace was always conferred upon infants in baptism,' p. 32." (p. 192.) And he frequently repeats the words, as if the denial was as to any grace being conferred. Now first, I particularly guard myself against the supposition that I quote Peter Lombard as "on my side"; and secondly, the Archdeacon would see in p. 38 of Appendix, that I limited the word "grace" by adding "*sanc-*

tifying," and I leave any one to read the passages I have quoted, and judge for himself whether or not the passages I have given from Peter Lombard do not fully bear out what I have said respecting them. The way in which the Archdeacon would explain these passages is not reconcileable with the language used in them. And I may say the same as to the authorities from the Canon Law quoted in p. 32, commented upon by the Archdeacon in pp. 205, 206 ; except that the Archdeacon is perfectly right in saying that I should have quoted the latter as the Council of Vienne, not (as I called it, by the Latin name) Vienna. The Latin names, however, are frequently used in such cases, but here certainly it might lead to a mistake. But I shall meet the observations of the Archdeacon on these passages more fully hereafter.

I shall notice now but one more point. The Archdeacon is of course very anxious to get rid of the argument derived from the Baptismal Service in the Cologne Liturgy, and to rescue Archbishop Laurence from the charge of making a mistake about it or the views of its author. In my humble apprehension, he might as well have attempted to prove that two and two make five. The fact is plain and undeniable. Bucer belonged to the Reformed party, and is proved to have held views inconsistent with the notion of invariable spiritual regeneration in Baptism, and he drew up the Baptismal Service in the Cologne Liturgy. Consequently that Service is at least open to an interpretation consistent with his views. The fact that Melancthon gave his assent to the Service does not at all affect the argument. The Achdeacon's anxiety, however, on this point, has led him actually to deny that the Abp. "puts down Bucer as a Lutheran," and even to go so far as to say that the charge "is grounded only upon the fact that Laurence *speaks of the language of Herman's Service as Lutheran*." (p. 236.)!! I leave the reader to judge from the passages I have quoted how far this is correct. (p. 402, first ed. 438, 9. 2d. ed.)

The above remarks will probably show the reader the necessity of caution in reading the Archdeacon's Work. A more extended reply I must reserve for another opportunity.

Printed by C. F. Hodgson, 1 Gough Square, Fleet Street, London.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR;

AND SOLD BY

JOHN HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

A MEMOIR of the late Rev. W. GOODE, M.A., Rector of St. Andrew, Wardrobe, and St. Ann, Blackfriars. Second Edition; with Appendix of Select Letters. 8vo., price 9s. boards.

The MODERN CLAIMS to the POSSESSION of the EXTRAORDINARY GIFTS of the SPIRIT, stated and examined, and compared with the most remarkable Cases of a similar kind that have occurred in the Christian Church; with some General Observations on the Subject. Second Edition, with numerous Additions; and an APPENDIX on the HERESY with which the Claims are connected. 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.

An ANSWER to a LETTER addressed to the LORD CHANCELLOR on the CASE of the DISSENTERS. In a Letter to the Same. By a Clergyman. Second Edition. 8vo., price 1s.

A REPLY to the LETTERS on the VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE by a "QUIET LOOKER-ON." In Two Letters. By PHILALETHES. 8vo., price 1s.

TRACTS ON CHURCH RATES; viz.,

1. A BRIEF HISTORY of CHURCH RATES; proving the liability of a Parish to them to be a Common-Law Liability; including a Reply to the Statements on that subject in Sir John Campbell's Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Stanley on the Law of Church Rates. Second Edition, considerably enlarged.

2. A REPLY to the ARTICLE on CHURCH RATES in the EDINBURGH REVIEW, No. 143.

3. A REPLY to the ANSWER of the EDINBURGH REVIEW to the two following Publications: 1. A Brief History of Church Rates. 2. A Reply to the Article on Church Rates in the Edinburgh Review, No. 134. In Two Letters to the Editor.

4. A FINAL REPLY to the ANSWER of the Author of the Articles on Church Rates in the Edinburgh Review. In a Letter to the Editor.

The above Four Tracts in one vol., price 7s. 6d. boards.

The DIVINE RULE of FAITH and PRACTICE; or, a Defence of the Catholic Doctrine that Holy Scripture has been, since the times of the Apostles, the Sole Divine Rule of Faith and Practice to the Church, against the dangerous errors of the Authors of the Tracts for the Times and the Romanists, as, particularly, that the Rule of Faith is "made up of Scripture and Tradition together," &c. In which also the doctrines of the Apostolical Succession, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, &c. are fully discussed In two vols. 8vo., price 32s. cloth.

(*This last Work has been for several years out of print.*)

SOME DIFFICULTIES in the LATE CHARGE of the LORD BISHOP of OXFORD, respectfully pointed out in a Letter to his Lordship. Second Edition. 8vo., price 1s.

TWO TREATISES on the CHURCH; the first by THOMAS JACKSON, D.D., commended by Dr. Pusey as "One of the best and greatest minds our Church has nurtured;" the second by ROBERT SANDERSON, D.D., formerly Lord Bishop of Lincoln; to which is added a Letter of BISHOP COSIN on the validity of the Orders of the foreign Reformed Churches. Edited with Introductory Remarks. Small 8vo. 5s. cloth.

The CASE AS IT IS: or, a Reply to the Letter of Dr. Pusey to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, including a Compendious Statement of the doctrines and views of the Tractators as expressed by themselves. Third Edition. 8vo., price 1s.

ALTARS PROHIBITED by the CHURCH of ENGLAND. In Two Parts. 8vo., price 2s. 6d.

A LETTER to a LAY FRIEND, in Answer to Inquiries respecting the state of things in the Church, and the Course which the present Crisis demands from those who tender its welfare. Second Edition. 8vo., 1s.

TRACT XC. HISTORICALLY REFUTED; or, a Reply to a Work by the Rev. F. Oakeley, entitled, "The Subject of Tract xc. Historically Examined." 8vo., price 5s.

A FEW REMARKS on the RELIGIOUS OPINIONS RELIEF BILL, and the OATH of SUPREMACY. 8vo., price 6d.

REMARKS on the "CLERGY OFFENCES BILL," as proposed to Parliament in 1847, and re-introduced, with a few alterations, in 1848. Reprinted from the "Christian Observer" for Sept. 1847 and March 1848. 8vo., price 6d.

REMARKS on ATTEMPTED RESTORATIONS of POPISH FITTINGS in CHURCHES, &c. Reprinted from the "Christian Observer" for April 1848. 8vo., price 6d.

A DEFENCE of the XXXIX ARTICLES as the Legal and Canonical Test of Doctrine in the Church of England in all points treated of in them; being a Reply to the Bishop of Exeter's Remarks upon a Clause proposed for insertion in the "Clergy Offences Bill." Second Edition. 8vo., price 1s.

A VINDICATION of the "DEFENCE of the XXXIX ARTICLES," in Reply to the recent "Charge" of the Lord Bishop of Exeter. Second Edition. To which is added, an Appendix, containing Additional Remarks, &c. 8vo., price 2s. 6d.

REVIEW of the JUDGMENT of SIR H. J. FUST, Kt., in the CASE of GORHAM *v.* the BISHOP of EXETER. Reprinted from the "Christian Observer" for December 1849. 8vo., price 1s.

DATE DUE

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY

978-5851

SEP 26 2001